could still be quite an economic and efficient lure. The fact that the South Australian department imported the seed of the angelica in an effort to produce its own oil seed, shows that that State is far ahead of Western Australia in the way it is combating fruit-fly.

It is a fact that our department has now recommended the use of yeast extracts or protein hydrolysate, but some of those that have been on the market have not been very effective at all. It is claimed that I.C.I. now has one equal to the one in America, but that has yet to be proved. It appears that there are different grades of this hydrolysate, some being effective and some not. So if the department will concentrate on getting these new lures, I am sure that the poisons we have at our disposal could be mixed with the lure and so ensure a greater measure of control against the pest, and perhaps the hope of eventual eradication.

I would now like to quote from the South African journal which mentioned fruit-fly. The article first emphasised the need for winter baiting and then went on as follows:—

> More Attractive Baits.
>
> Certain forms of protein are more attractive than sugar to fruit-flies, especially during the winter months. Experiments proved that hydrolyzed proteins of relatively high grade from several overseas sources are more effective than the local products available commercially. However, by far the best results were obtained with a home-made brew, according to the following formula:—
>
> White sugar—1½ lb.
> Brewer's yeast 1 oz.—2 cubes.
> Water—4 gals.
>
> The attractiveness of this brew as a fruit-fly spray was first discovered by Mr. J. D. Rust (Technical Officer, Entomology), who found that it must first be allowed to "work" or foment for at least two or three weeks in a wooden barrel or a galvanized or painted metal container. Mix the 2 ozs. of 15 per cent. malathion with 4 gals of the brew. Make only as much poison spray as can be used immediately.

That article indicates that the South African people have been very much alive to the need for a lure which will be effective against the fly, and even though it is a home brew—some of those home brews are most effective, as the Kentucky hillbillies will tell us—it is one which can be very effective. I believe that the department should carry out some trial test, using that method to lure the flies.

The growers have indicated their willingness to further tax themselves to provide funds for fruit-fly control; and the Government, through the Minister, has indicated its willingness to subsidise that money put in by the growers. Therefore if we go along the right lines and get the right lures, we can start from those districts where the fly incidence is least and push it back gradually to the metropolitan area which seems to be the worst infected part of the whole State.

If by then the experience gained has shown that there is a possibility of eradicating the pest, I can see no reason why, with a scheme somewhat similar to that which was put forward for the eradication of the Argentine ant—although fruit-fly is a different pest and much harder to eradicate—we could not eventually eradicate it from this State.

Because the growers have recommended this measure, and have shown their willingness to tax themselves, I can do nothing else but support the Bill. But I would like the Minister to tell us precisely how much the Government is going to expend by way of a subsidy; and whether it is just the sum of £13,100, or that amount plus approximately £10,000 which it is already providing. I support the second reading.

On motion by Mr. Wild, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.32 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, the 4th December, 1958.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS—*continued.*

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 3.30 p.m., and read prayers.

RAILWAYS.

Use of Newcastle Coal to Obviate Fire Risk.

1. The Hon. C. R. ABBEY asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is the Minister aware of the great fire hazard on lands adjoining the Great Southern and branch railway lines, and the concern felt by farmers and local authorities at the continued fire risk caused by the use of Collie coal?

(2) Will the Minister give an undertaking to use Newcastle coal on these lines until the main danger period is over?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1) The fire hazard is no greater on the Great Southern main line than on other lines where Collie coal is used.

(2) Imported coal is being used on all branch lines stemming from the Great Southern main line.

TIMBER.

Contract for Karri Cross-arms.

2. The Hon. J. MURRAY asked the Minister for Railways:

With regard to the contract for karri cross-arms, will the Minister inform the House—

(a) The price tendered sawn;

(b) The price tendered sawn and treated;

(c) What amount is included in these prices as the cost of transport to the buyer's depot?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

Until the Commonwealth Government publishes details of the tenders and all the papers relative to the contract are finalised, it is considered inadvisable to reveal this information at this stage. However, should the hon. member pursue the matter at a later date, the information will be made available to him.

RAILWAYS.

Replacement of Coaches on Albany Train.

3. The Hon. J. M. THOMSON asked the Minister for Railways:

(1) In view of the discomfort experienced by passengers travelling in the side-door type coaches attached to the Albany train, is it the intention of the Railway Department to replace them with corridor-type coaches?

(2) If so, will such replacement be effected prior to the Christmas traffic?

(3) If not, when can it be expected?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND replied:

(1), (2), and (3) It is not agreed that passengers experience discomfort when travelling in side door coaches. This type of coach is more convenient for passengers alighting and joining en route where platforms are not available. However, these coaches cannot be withdrawn from service until new stock is available to replace them.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3) SELECT COMMITTEE.

Report Presented.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith presented the report of the Select Committee, together with a typewritten copy of the evidence and correspondence referred to in the report.

On motion by the Minister for Railways, resolved:—

> That consideration of the report in Committee be made an Order of the Day for a later stage of the sitting.

INDUSTRY (ADVANCES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (Minister for Industrial Development—North) [3.45] in moving the second reading said: This short Bill is introduced to amend the Industry (Advances) Act, No. 52 of 1947. That Act was introduced by the then Premier, the hon. Sir Ross McLarty, and his references as to the need for the measure may be found in Vol. 2 of Hansard for that year, when it was found desirable to take from the specific control of the Rural and Industries Bank Act those portions of the

law which related to the advances to industry which came under the agency section of the Rural and Industries Bank Act.

The Bill sets out to amend the parent Act of 1947, wherein an advance to industry is related to Section 6 of the Rural and Industries Bank Act, which gives a broad and unlimited interpretation of the word "industry." It is significant that for a period of 11 years that wording was deemed to be all that was necessary in any transactions that came within the purview of that Act. In the past that provision has been interpreted very widely and guarantees have been given by the Treasurer, for the Government, to activities which it considered worthy of assistance. Over that period the Act has been called into operation on many occasions.

The persons interested in a local enterprise associated with the development of Canterbury Court made an approach to the Treasurer for an advance or, in lieu of an advance, a guarantee under this Act to enable them to finance the project. This was taken up by the Prudential Assurance Co. Ltd., and it had agreed; and the Government's guarantee of £250,000 to assist in the building of Canterbury Court was approved; but all of a sudden—at very short notice—the Government was informed that the solicitors in Melbourne had advised the company that the guarantee offering under this Act—worded as it is—was no longer of any use and therefore not acceptable to the company.

I would point out that the Prudential Assurance Co. Ltd. is not short of funds. We have heard, in vulgar parlance, the expression that some people have more money than the Queen; but I think in this case we could say that this company has a lot of money—

The Hon. H. K. Watson: It is not short of prudence, either.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think there is some doubt in that regard, but it is certainly not short of caution. It wants guarantees for things which require no guarantee at all, in my view; and it relies on a doubt expressed by a solicitor—one of its advisers on all its business—that the Act, as it stands, is not a sufficient guarantee for the company that the Government guarantee is worth while. That is the situation. The company wants the guarantee covered, beyond all doubt, by a Bill of this nature.

The immediate effect of this doubt is to place the proposed building on the Canterbury Court site in jeopardy. Early this year, the building now known as Canterbury Court, at one time comprised the Shaftesbury Theatre, and the offices and shops in the arcade. A company advertised a scheme in which it was stated that offices, flats and a motor parking station up to nine storeys high would be built to alleviate and assist the serious parking problem in Perth.

When the scheme was put before the Government it considered it from more than one angle; not the least important of which was the ability to finance or guarantee this loan in order to assist the building industry through a difficult period, because much employment is represented in the constructional alterations to this building.

The Hon. R. C. Mattiske: Why did not the Government do the same with the R. & I. Bank building?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: There are reasons for that, too. In any case, with the doubt that has been expressed by the company's solicitors, with which at least some solicitors in Perth do not agree, the necessity for this Bill arose. It means that the original guarantee of the Prudential Assurance Co., which was given subject only to the guarantee proposed under this legislation, is considered by the company to be of no use unless the parent Act is amended according to the provisions of this Bill.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Does the Government propose to charge any fee for this guarantee as it does under the Housing Guarantee Act?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Certain fees are charged.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Is it a fee of 1 per cent. or 5 per cent. per annum for guaranteeing?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: No, it is a fee which is governed by the rates and charges applying in the agency section of the R. & I. Bank. That is the connection. A wide interpretation of the word "industry" in the Rural and Industries Bank Act and limiting factors would be imposed if the amendments on the notice paper are agreed to. This Act has been in force for 11 years, and there has never been raised a cavil against any transaction, either in regard to the wisdom of making advances that have been made under it; whether it be the guarantee of the oats or barley pools which represent approximately £3,500,000 this year, or other matters which are not mentioned in the Bill, but which would be covered by it.

It is evident that if arguments are allowed to develop on the narrow interpretation of the word "industry", which drastically affects and restricts the Government's authority to use—as it is authorised to use under the Rural and Industries Bank Act—that bank for the purpose of making advances, serious harm could be suffered by this State. The parent Act gave wide unlimited powers in regard to the word "industry" because of the manner of its presentation, as will be needed in the Rural and Industries Bank Act, which statute is read in conjunction with the Industry (Advances) Act of 1947.

If the Canterbury Court project—which started from an application for advance for a loan repayable over a long period—is turned down—

The Hon. H. K. Watson: What is the period?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I am not sure as to the wisdom of laying absolutely bare the private transactions of this company in its approach to the Government, or as handled by the Government as guarantor, or the financiers, the Prudential Assurance Co., but I can answer the hon. Mr. Watson by saying it is something a little less than 50 years.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: Thank you.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The loan was and is conditional upon the Government guarantee. The Prudential Assurance Co. in giving evidence of the prudence referred to by the hon. Mr. Watson, goes a great deal further than that. It could, in effect, place some doubt on the validity of the use of money from the Rural and Industries Bank; the State's own financial institution. Of course, anything in my view which is harmful to that institution is something about which every Western Australian should sit up and take notice.

When this Canterbury Court project is completed it will cost in the vicinity of £500,000; that is the advice we obtained through the Press. At the time it was thought by the Government and the Treasurer, in whom authority is vested for these transactions, that the purpose was not only valid under the provisions of the Act, but also it would be a good thing for the State of Western Australia by fostering progress in this sort of industry. I repeat that, in the 11 years that the Act has operated, there has never been a question raised about it; never been a mention made in or out of Parliament. And, of course, if the Treasurer's judgment at any stage of this State's history—no matter which Treasurer it may be—is to be doubted, it would certainly be raised in Parliament and would affect the Treasurer very quickly. However, that is not the case.

This measure was introduced to clarify an unfair situation brought about by the opinion of a legal gentleman who is not in this State; an opinion which raises a doubt. In his advice to the Prudential Assurance Co., this solicitor states that the company should not make the advance—even under guarantee—if there is a doubt of the validity of the advance under this Act. The Industries Assistance Acts of other days, and the Industry (Advances) Act of 1947, working in parallel with the Rural and Industries Bank Act, have made great contributions to various Western Australian industries.

Wherever there has been an approach made to the Government for assistance—not only to Labour Governments but to other Governments—the interpretation of the Treasurer has not been questioned. The meaning of "industry" has never before been raised. It not only casts a doubt on the ability of the Government to do this as a firm transaction, as a guarantee, but it casts considerable doubt upon the ability of Canterbury Court to proceed, and on the ability of the Government to assist, from time to time, other worthy projects.

This is therefore brought forward by the Government, not that it confirms that Government legal advice supports the view, but because of the persistence of the Prudential Assurance Co. in not being prepared to accept the doubt; it wants a Government guarantee, and it assures us that, if there is a risk at all, it is not prepared to take it.

Accordingly I present the Bill to the House, hoping that hon. members will see how important it is to remove the doubt, and to ratify transactions that may be in a similar position to advances formerly made, and to give the Government the opportunity of continuing to use its bank to guarantee worthy instrumentalities, organisations or industries which may be applying for assistance from time to time.

I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. H. K. WATSON (Metropolitan) [4.3]: I would like to have secured the adjournment of the debate on this Bill for one week to give it the study which I think it requires, because it raises many serious issues. However, the House is expected to rise tomorrow so I will proceed now as best I can—if imperfectly—to give my reasons why the Bill should not be passed in its present form.

At the outset I would emphasise that the Bill has nothing to do with the ordinary banking business of the Rural and Industries Bank; nothing whatever. The ordinary banking business of the Rural and Industries Bank is covered under the general trading section of the Act by which it was created, and it has power to carry out all kinds of banking business within banking prudence, and according to recognised banking practice. I would stress that aspect to the House. This Bill, and the parent Act which it seeks to amend, have their genesis in the Industries Assistance Act of 1915. That was the year when this State had a grievous drought; when many farmers were in dire distress. The Industries Assistance Act was introduced to alleviate their financial troubles of the day.

The Industries Assistance Act was administered by what was then known as the Agricultural Bank, and it was within the knowledge of any person, of ordinary intelligence, as to just what the object of that Act was. It was an Act to assist the farming industry; and distressed farmers

at that. It was administered by the Agricultural Bank. When the Rural and Industries Bank took over the Agricultural Bank, it also took over the guarantees and advances which had been made under the Industries Assistance Act. Then, to take the place of the old restricted section of the Industries Assistance Act of 1915 there was passed the Industry (Advances) Act of 1947.

The object of the Industry (Advances) Act of 1947 is provided in Section 3 of that Act, and reads substantially as follows:—

> The Treasurer may render financial assistance by making advances or guaranteeing any advance made to any person engaged in mining or other industry who applies for such assistance, and who satisfies the Treasurer that, in the interests of the State, such assistance should be given.

The Act then goes on to say—

> A certificate in the prescribed form under the hand of the Treasurer . . . shall be conclusive evidence of the facts therein stated.

The Act also provides—

> This Act shall be read and construed as one with the Rural and Industries Bank Act, 1944, and words and expressions used in this Act shall, subject to the context, have the same meaning as such words or expressions respectively have in the Rural and Industries Bank Act, 1944.

In the Rural and Industries Bank Act of 1944 the definition of "industry" is shown as including every trade or business, or firm or branch of production, labour, or other activity, having for its object the production or manufacture of marketable products or things. I would suggest that any ordinary person with a knowledge of the old Industries Assistance Act, reading this Act, would require no special brilliance to know that the aim and object of that Act was not to give the Treasurer power, willy-nilly, to make loans, or to give guarantees, to every and any businessman who came along to him with a pretty good commercial proposition. That was never intended.

The whole aim and object of this Act was to assist and promote deserving industries such as the mining industry, the farming industry and secondary industry, where it could be shown there was a reasonable prospect of success. I was always under the impression that industry does not—certainly in the absence of some express enlargement—mean trade and commerce generally. Much less, in my opinion, does it include ballroom dancing or the mere province of a city landlord.

I am astonished to hear the Minister suggest it could ever have been contemplated that under the Industries Assistance Act the Treasurer could virtually carry on the general banking business of advancing money to a service station or ballroom; or of guaranteeing a loan to any other individuals around the town; or making an advance to any city property-holder who wanted to improve his property. Far from expressing surprise that such a course as that is not permitted, I would suggest that no-one, except someone reading the Act, in an attempt deliberately to get around the Act, could even suggest that it was susceptible to such an interpretation.

We have been told that the erection of Canterbury Court will provide employment. Great Scott! That could be said of any new building around the town. If I had a vacant block in St. George's Terrace, on the argument advanced by the Minister, I could obtain a Government advance or guarantee if I could find an insurance company prepared to make me a loan.

Let us bear this in mind; when a lender lends only on a Government guarantee, he is not greatly concerned with the basic nature of the security. So long as he has a Government guarantee it is of no great concern to him whether the borrower spends the money and gets 20s. in the £1 worth of value, or whether he spends the money at the races.

It seems to me that under this Bill, as it stands at the moment, there are all manner of possibilities. If it is good enough for the Government to support this ballroom and parking station over the bridge, what is going to happen if the Tivoli comes tomorrow and says, "We want to build a service station"? Or if the parking stations between St. George's Terrace and the Esplanade likewise came along? They would have an equal case.

I submit that it was never within the contemplation of this Act for any such private owner to have the right to be given an advance by the State Treasurer or to have a loan from some other institution and be guaranteed by the State Treasury. I submit it is not a function of the State Treasurer—and never has been—to act as Father Christmas; or as guarantor to a city property-holder.

I am astonished at the arguments advanced by the Minister in support of this Bill. On the reasoning he has just given, it would be quite conceivable—under the Bill—for some group of speculators, tomorrow morning, to decide to form a hire-purchase company and ask the Government for an advance, or get the Government to guarantee a loan.

This Act was intended to assist industry; and, generally, to assist industries which would not have much hope of prospering without assistance. One has only to read the Auditor-General's report to see that, in the main, the Act has been designed to assist and has been used to assist the halt, the maimed, the lame and the blind, speaking industrially.

Glancing through the Auditor-General's report, I notice that the guarantees at the moment amount to something like £1,000,000. However, it is not clear to me whether that £4,000,000 includes the total liability with respect to Chamberlain Industries.

It is one thing, as a national policy, assisting a doubtful mining proposition or assisting doubtful industry—and when I say industry I mean industry—but it is an entirely different matter using the same provisions of this Act to make advances or guarantee advances to an ordinary city commercial proposition. The Minister has said that for 11 years the Treasurer has gone along in his own sweet way making advances to this concern, and guaranteeing that concern, without protest from anyone.

Before a protest can be lodged, one has to know that the event has taken place. What opportunity has any hon. member of this Parliament of knowing what guarantees have been given? Had it not been for the action of the Prudential Insurance Company's lawyer in drawing attention, not to the surprising contents of the Act, but, to my mind, to the obvious contents of it, this question would not have cropped up.

The position might have been different if, in 1947, when the Industry (Advances) Act was passed, Parliament had put into the Act the clause which you, Mr. President, thought should be included and which you moved to be inserted.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It is not in the Act now.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: I did not say it was in the Act, but that it should be. Had this provision been included, Parliament would not have been kept in the dark during the past 11 years. The following is the provision which the President endeavoured to have inserted in the Act in 1947:—

> The Treasurer shall as soon as possible in each financial year submit to Parliament a return of all advances made during the preceding year, setting out all conditions of such advances and also a return of all outstanding advances made under this Act.

That amendment was carried in this House; was disagreed with by the Assembly; and upon being returned here was not insisted upon. Had Parliament, in 1947, accepted the views which you, Sir, so wisely put before it, I can assure the Minister that the Treasurer, the Treasury officers and the bank officers, would not have gone for 11 years without their actions being queried—if their actions during the past 11 years included a number of transactions such as the one we are asked to validate this afternoon.

Another weakness in the Act, as it stands at the moment, with respect to industry—that is mining industry, farming industry and secondary industry, but not trade or commerce—is that there is no limit to the amount which may be advanced or guaranteed. At one time the law limited to £10,000 the amount which could be advanced or guaranteed. Those days have gone. Having regard to present money values, one would not necessarily suggest that every advance or guarantee made by the Treasurer should be approved by Parliament; but I do feel there should be some limit when we find that an amount of £250,000 can be guaranteed in one transaction.

If it became known that this were possible under the Act, we would find at the Treasurer's office, a queue of people, extending the full length of St. George's Terrace, wanting to avail themselves of the opportunity to improve their properties on these conditions. As I talk, I remember that only last year Bible House, which certainly improved the city, was short of funds, and there was a grave doubt, during the progress of the work on the building, whether it could be completed. It never occurred to the people responsible for building Bible House, to pop along to the Treasurer and get from him a guarantee for the balance of the money. It would not occur to any businessman to do that. I submit it takes a really bright boy to think that one up!

Yesterday the hon. Dr. Hislop thought it would be a good idea if we had a booklet prepared telling the public the contents of the Hire-Purchase Act. I think it would be a jolly good idea to have a booklet prepared telling the officers of the Rural and Industries Bank and those of the Treasury, the contents of the Industry (Advances) Act. It seems to me that, without any real justification, attempts have been made to get around the Act, or right away from its real purpose. That sort of thing is not unknown in Government circles. There is nothing like the fait accompli. We know the State Government Insurance Office has reached the standard it has attained today through what was nothing more than illegal action for many years. We know, too, that within the precincts of Parliament a building was erected contrary to law, with a view to presenting Parliament with a fait accompli.

Therefore I find myself quite unimpressed by the Minister's argument that because this building has been commenced, we should confirm the action of the Treasurer in giving the guarantee. This would not be the first building that had been commenced and remained unfinished for want of finance. Plenty of farmers throughout the State today find that, having spent their capital, they still want a few thousand pounds to complete necessary improvements. The last time I was in Sydney I saw an unfinished six-storey

structure in Castlereagh-st. There was not a workman on it. I inquired from my friend the reason why. He said that the building was the result of the efforts of a co-operative company. The idea was that each tenant would own his own floor. The estimated price was £80,000 for the completed building. The £80,000 was spent, but the building was only half finished. When I was there, the structure was standing as a monument to the unbusinesslike methods of businesslike men.

If we have a look at the position with respect to Canterbury Court we find that the Minister has said he feels he is not at liberty to discuss in Parliament the private affairs of any company. I say that is all right so long as the affairs are private, but the affairs of any individual or any company cease to be private when Government funds, to the tune of £250,000 are advanced—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Not advanced.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: —or are advanced by another company and guaranteed by the Government. In such a case, the affairs of the company should no longer be withheld from Parliament. Beggars cannot be choosers. It would appear that in this case the total cost of the project is £284,000, and the amount being contributed by the company is £9,500, plus the freehold land; and £250,000 is to come from an insurance company with a guarantee by the Government.

So far as erecting buildings in the city is concerned, and indeed so far as erecting most factory buildings is concerned, it is a common practice for a company or a landowner to go to an insurance company and get a loan of £50,000, £100,000 or £150,000. I suppose that most city buildings have been erected on that basis. I know of many factory buildings that have been erected on the same basis; but that is ordinary commercial practice. They get loans from insurance companies and they mortgage their premises to those companies. There is no question of a Government guarantee.

If we are going to open the door wide for any person carrying on business to get a Government guarantee, this Parliament is certainly looking for trouble. We will find that the Treasurer will become guarantee-happy. To my mind, a guarantee is an insidious sort of thing; and I have always made it a rule in my life that I would not guarantee my best friend.

The Hon. H. L. Roche: What about your enemy?

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: All one has to do at the moment, so far as a guarantee is concerned, is to sign one's name on the dotted line. But the chickens do come home to roost. Throwing my mind back to the dark days of 1930, I can remember one of Perth's wealthiest citizens who had to call a meeting of his creditors because he had been guarantee-happy during the preceding 10 years.

While I have referred to Canterbury Court, inasmuch as the Minister mentioned it in his speech, I have been dealing with the principle. I am not concerned with Canterbury Court as such; for all I know, I may have some friends who are shareholders in it. It is the principle with which I am concerned. If there is any doubt as to whether any marketing boards or the Barley Pool, the Wheat Pool, or any others like that, are covered by the definition, there is no reason why that doubt should not be removed. But that is a very different matter to extending the existing provisions of the Act, as we have known them to exist for 40 years, to include not only industries, but also every other conceivable activity we can think of. I am not going to oppose the second reading, but I shall certainly oppose the third reading if the Bill is not altered in Committee.

THE HON. R. C. MATTISKE (Metropolitan) [4.33]: I do not intend to delay the House long on this measure, because I think the whole of the ground has been amply covered by my colleague. But there are one or two aspects to which I feel I must make reference. At the outset I must refer to the great play made by the Minister for Industrial Development on the legal opinion gathered from outside this State. He spoke as though it was really something outstanding to have thrown a spanner in the works at a late stage in the negotiations in this manner, through a careful reading—and that is all I consider it need be—of the definition of the word "industry" in Section 6 of the Rural and Industries Bank Act.

I think the words "having for its object the production or manufacture of marketable products or things" could not be interpreted as being sufficient to cover the proposed loan for the purpose of constructing a car parking building. During the current session of Parliament we have had two or three measures which we have had to pass in order to validate actions of the Government—actions which the Government itself has admitted have been illegal—because the Government has either gone ahead with complete abandon, or else with insufficient advice from those who should be in a position to advise.

Personally I am getting a little tired of it. I think the time has arrived when this State should adopt a far more responsible attitude, and that we should say that if any action be commenced illegally it should be completely abandoned and the project submitted to Parliament from the very start of the negotiations. Parliament should have the right to consider all aspects before any action is taken rather than be asked to apply a rubber stamp after the Government has committed itself to a certain extent.

In this particular case if, as has been stated, it required a legal opinion at a late stage in the negotiations to point out that it is illegal for a loan to be made, because of the present interpretation of the word "industry"; and if, as has been implied, there have been many loans made during the past 10 years which may also be illegal, I would ask this question—"What is wrong with the auditors of the Rural and Industries Bank? Are they carrying out their work properly?" They surely cannot be doing so if they have not drawn attention to the fact that loans have been made beyond the powers conferred upon the bank by its Act.

I do not know whether it is because we are nearing the end of the session, or because it is nearly Christmas time, but I feel, in regard to this particular measure, that we should permit the negotations that have advanced to this stage to continue. One very good reason for my thinking in that direction is that this project, although it is not assisting industry to produce anything, will be providing a facility which is urgently needed for the proper development of this city. I am of the opinion that in the near future parking will be a far greater problem than it is at present, and that a project of this nature will do much to help alleviate that problem and assist in the proper development of the city.

Therefore I think that leniency should be shown in this case and, for that purpose, I have on the notice paper certain amendments to which I hope the House will agree. These amendments will permit the present negotiations to be completed but, at the same time, will prevent the Government of the day in the future from making loans at random when and how it feels they should be made. I think that the Bill in its present form is an exceptionally bad one. Not only does it permit the Government to exceed its functions of governing by entering into fields which were never intended to be covered by a Government but, as was stated by the hon. Mr. Watson, it will encourage people to make nuisances of themselves by applying to the Government for assistance for every scheme that any impecunious person may hatch up.

I feel that if this measure be passed in its present form it will leave the door wide open; and it is not the function of the Government to do that. If there be money available, either directly or indirectly, I think it should be made available to sources which can produce something, provide employment and generally assist in the development of the State.

The Minister for Industrial Development stated that another reason behind the Government's desire to assist in this particular project was the fact that it was a substantial building, and, as such, would give the building industry a fillip at a time when it was suffering from a certain amount of recession. On that point, if the Government were sincere in its desire, it has had plenty of scope to assist the building industry, starting with the new building for the Rural and Industries Bank.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: And with £9,000,000 worth of other Government buildings.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: Yes. I do not think that the Government can be sincere when it says that it desires to help the building industry, otherwise it would surely have given greater consideration to having those works done by private contractors rather than on the day-labour basis.

In another place mention was made of the fact that the Bill in its present form was necessary to permit the Government to make advances for the furtherance of art in this State, or for any other need of a like nature. Rather than leave the door so wide open, as it will be if the Bill is passed in its present form, it would be far better for the Government, if it desires to construct a national theatre for instance, to come to Parliament and say, "We have no power under any existing legislation to assist in this direction and we require to do so and so." If all the facts were then placed before Parliament, and the scheme considered worthy, appropriate action would be taken and the project would be proceeded with.

I think that is the correct method of approach, and that we should not leave a signed blank cheque waiting for any project that may come up in the future. I intend to support the second reading of the Bill so that the present negotiations with Canterbury Court can be finalised. Therefore, I have placed certain amendments on the notice paper, to which I hope the Committee will agree. In the meantime, I support the second reading.

On motion by the Hon. L. C. Diver, debate adjourned till a later stage of the sitting.

FACTORIES AND SHOPS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading—Defeated.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North) [4.45] in moving the second reading said: This Bill contains two proposals of a widely differing nature. The first relates to protection for employees. In every State of Australia efforts are being made to intensify the promotion of safety in industry. There is an increasing regard for the necessity for Australia to increase her productivity if she desires to remain in the industrial field and compete in the home and overseas markets.

One of the factors which has been explored is industrial accident prevention, it being realised that active attention to this problem can result in great humanitarian and economic gain. While it is not possible to provide accurate information as to the impact of industrial accidents on the Australian economy, as comprehensive statistics in this connection are not kept, we are able to assess the total Australian annual industrial accident figures as being approximately:—

Fatal accidents	500
Injuries disabling for one or more days	350,000

We are also able to assess the lost working time from accidents as being roughly equivalent to the continuous absence from work of 30,000 men.

The toll of human suffering, pain and unnecessary bereavement brought about by these accidents demands that attention be given to devise ways and means of reducing them to the lowest possible minimum.

Apart from humanitarian reasons, another compelling reason for meeting the problem is the economic loss. Once again no accurate figures exist, but we do know that workers' compensation claims in Australia for the year 1955-56 amounted to a little more than £30,000,000.

While this is the direct cost, it is added to by such things as the cost of the lost time of the injured employee; the cost of the lost time of other employees who stop out of curiosity and sympathy to assist the injured persons; the cost of time lost by foremen and other executives as a result of the accident.

There are other items such as the cost of investigating the accident; of arranging for production to be continued by another employee; breaking in new employees; and costs due to damaged machines, tools and other property and material.

It is claimed by accident prevention authorities that by applying a factor of four to the total workers' compensation claim payments, it is possible to arrive at a fair estimate of the total economic loss. This means that the annual economic wastage in Australia through industrial accidents costs approximately £120,000,000.

This toll is staggering, and it must be borne in mind that this figure does not include accidents to self-employed persons, or accidents such as by fire or explosion where no one is injured, but which may result in heavy property damage.

It has been established that the cost of industrial accidents far out-weighs that of industrial strikes and stoppages in Australia. Western Australia has its share of this problem. What it is we do not know, as at the moment we have no accurate statistics, but we must move to reduce the toll.

Industrial accidents cannot be prevented by law alone, but it is estimated that one-third of all accidents can be prevented by sound regulations and safety codes, which in other States have resulted in a very short time in considerable direct savings. Queensland, in a matter of 12 months, by an active accident prevention programme, effected a reduction in workers' compensation claims of £300,000 and was able to reduce premiums by 10 per cent. At the present time there is no power in the parent Act to make special safety regulations apply to other than factories.

This Bill seeks to authorise the making of regulations to protect manual workers elsewhere than in factories. It is not a problem which can be attacked piecemeal. If we are to promulgate the necessary codes and regulations to prevent industrial accidents, we must be able to do so in all places where people work.

Already there are two subjects which are causing concern. One of these is the use of explosive-powered tools. At the moment there is no power to legislate for the control of this new development. These devices are called by a variety of names such as explosive-powered tools, bolt pistols, cartridge operated tools, etc.

A variety of types are available in Western Australia and are being used in ever-increasing numbers in the building and allied trades. As hon. members know, they are used mainly to drive nails and bolts into concrete, brick or steel, and are capable of driving a bolt to a surprising depth. The weight of the charge can be varied depending on the power required.

It is apparent that a number of serious hazards can arise from weaknesses such as poor design, lack of safety devices on the tool, lack of provision of safe methods, and misuse by irresponsible or inexperienced operators. All these conditions could be prevented by a simple code.

Another matter which needs protective regulations is the cleaning of windows in the multi-storey buildings which are arising in Western Australia. It is a common sight in Perth to see men cleaning windows in high buildings, as far up as a hundred feet or more above the pavement.

These men in some cases stand on sloping sills, hold wherever they can grip by one hand, and wield their cleaning cloths with the other. Apart from the considerable and unnecessary risk to which these people are exposed, it is obvious that a person working under these conditions could not be efficient, and action should be taken to improve the position.

Section 55 of the parent Act does not lightly grant the power to make special regulations dealing with dangerous trades.

Proposed regulations have to be published in newspapers circulating in the districts concerned, and provision is made for the lodging of objections to the proposals. If the objections appear reasonable the proposals can be withdrawn or amended, or an enquiry may be held.

The practice in recent years has been for conferences to be called of interested parties to discuss the draft regulations. This has taken place in the case of superphosphate, benzene, foundry, welding and cutting, and draft regulations for the prevention of eye injuries are under scrutiny by interested parties at present. It is considered that the proposed amendment would be a potent factor in reducing industrial accidents and as a result increase the industrial productivity of the State.

The second proposal in the Bill relates to the hours in which a grocery warehouse may trade. The parent Act defines a warehouse as—

> Any building, premises or place in or from which goods are sold, offered for sale, or distributed by wholesale only.

There is no classification of warehouses and there is no provision in the Act for closing times of warehouses. In fact, there is very little reference to warehouses at all in the parent Act. Until recently, trading hours for warehouses have caused little concern. However, a new development as far as Western Australia is concerned, recently occurred in that one grocery warehouse commenced to trade from 6.30 a.m. to 9 p.m. on week days on a self-service basis.

This, of course, meant that immediately all opposition warehouses were forced to observe the same hours if they desired to stay in business, so that an additional six to ten hours of trading is now operating. A survey of the position has revealed that few of the warehouses are in favour of this new development, but while one remains open, all must of necessity follow suit.

There appears to be no doubt that as all firms enter into this field and pay the correct rates of pay, that is, penalty rates, plus lighting and other charges, additional overhead is immediately added to the wholesale cost of groceries. If people are working after hours at penalty rates, their wages must come from somewhere, so that there seems to be little doubt that the scheme which apparently originally started as an effort by one firm to recapture business must eventually have the effect of generally increasing prices and contributing to more hardship for the small grocery retailer who is competing against the big self-service stores.

It is agreed that this warehouse self-service scheme could result in a saving and a reduction in prices, but there is no need for the extended hours. This new development could lead to all sorts of complications. It is possible for a group of customers to band together and make group purchases at the wholesale rates, thereby trading after hours, and once again this would result in hardship to the ordinary retail shopkeeper; more so the small shopkeeper.

The Bill deals only with the hours of grocery warehouses and will keep their hours in line with the hours of trading of all other grocery establishments. A proviso has been included to prevent any restriction on the delivery of bulk goods or orders to or from the warehouses in question. The object of the proposition relating to warehouses is very obvious. It is designed to restrict the trading hours so as to give all traders an equal opportunity. No particular trader will be able to obtain an advantage over another. It appears to be a very reasonable proposition.

The first amendment contained in the Bill is designed to prevent injuries to workers who operate the various new powered tools which have come into use, and those engaged on the dangerous work of constructing the modern buildings, which in many cases are built mostly with glass. As one building in St. Georges Terrace, which is built almost entirely of glass, was being constructed a staging was lowered from the roof down the sides. The cleaners are able to use this as they constantly go up and down the face of the building to clean the windows. In my opinion, that is a very safe method of coping with that work.

There are many other buildings, including the one I occupy, where the cleaner hangs on with one hand, and stretches the other to clean the outside of the windows with a cloth. That is a dangerous practice. Provision has been made in the Factories and Shops Act to ensure that certain safety measures are prescribed and observed. The putting into operation of these measures has resulted in considerable economic savings in man hours and in a reduction of expenditure.

Only yesterday reference was made in a newspaper to the fact it was much better for an industrial worker to lose one day through a stoppage of work, to ensure that he will not lose one day by having to attend the funeral of one of his fellow workers. Over the year that principle has been followed and safety measures have been brought into force under that principle.

I feel that the two provisions in the Bill will meet with the approval of this House, because they are both worth while. I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [4.59]: In listening to the speech of the Minister for Railways, no one can fail to be impressed with the fact that the Bill must be examined. One gains the distinct impression that it must be examined

with a very sympathetic outlook. As the Minister explained, the provisions in the Bill fall into two categories. The first deals with safety measures, and the second with hours of trading.

As I consider it much easier to deal with the second, I shall do so now, and return to the provision relating to safety measures at a later stage.

Warehouses have, at present, the legal right to open as they are doing at the moment. For a great number of years they have had that right but have not availed themselves of it until now, because the need did not exist. However, times and conditions change and we find today that the need must exist because they have availed themselves of their perfectly legal right to extend their hours to supply a service which they consider is required. A recent survey indicates that 90 per cent. of the small retail grocers definitely consider that these extended hours are necessary.

I remember, not very long ago, when there was considerable discussion dealing with the refusal to allow delivery trucks to be backed into lanes and regulations were drafted which made turntables compulsory. At that time, there was talk of the ultimate necessity to make all deliveries from bulk stores and warehouses during non-trading hours of the shops; in other words, during the evening. Of course that will come eventually. It will be found that the service is demanded and these warehouses will avail themselves of their legal right to extend hours. In this way the small shopkeeper would be able to go and make his own choice of the goods displayed, load them on to his own vehicle, take them home and put them in his store, and start on the morrow with his shelves full of the goods which his customers require. This would enable the shopkeeper to supply his customers with the articles they needed without having to keep large stocks on hand; and in this way his supplies would always be fresh.

These advantages are so obvious that I feel quite confident that this Council will not agree to this section of the Bill. I know it sounds attractive when it is said that certain people are being made to work these long hours and so on, but that, of course, is compensated for by the penalty rates paid. Even if that is not considered a satisfactory way of dealing with these matters, surely there are other methods open to us! For instance, shift work could be instigated as has been tried and proved successful throughout most other parts of the Western world. There is the aspect of "Buy Western Australian Goods" to be considered. Storekeepers would be able to keep their shelves stocked with these goods which would encourage their purchase.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: That is something we are all very keen about.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: I sincerely hope that despite the appearance of attraction at first glance, this Bill will not be agreed to, thus introducing these restrictions. It is becoming extremely unpleasant to drive a motor vehicle into town; in some cases it is even a hazardous experience. I am sure that, freed from party considerations, the hon. Mrs. Hutchison would probably support that remark. I have often heard her speak of how women are forced to become packhorses. How much easier it will be if, after the husband comes home at night, and has his shower and tea and in comfort he can get into his car with his family and drive to some shop or even the "corner shop" and legally be able to purchase the family's needs for the following day or week. In this way they would be a family group. But what is the situation at the moment? The wife has to take the car through heavy traffic and park it—sometimes some distance from the shops—and battle with loads of groceries all on her own.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: You are painting a very good picture.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: It is almost making me weep.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That will be the day when anyone as flint-hearted as the Minister for Railways is made to weep!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Even though the second section of this Bill might be—at first glance—considered attractive, the first section is much more attractive, again at first glance. I doubt whether there is any person in this country who would not be heart and soul behind any move which had a reasonable chance of assisting the safety, productivity, and all the other things mentioned by the Minister. After listening to his remarks, one is left with the impression that it would be axiomatic that the prevention of accidents was of such paramount importance that any Government or person would spend any amount of money in order to avoid accidents. If that is so, why is it that when a death occurs on a crossroad, and it can be proved that that death is the result of the crossroad, the Government of the day does not immediately construct either an underway or overway at such a site to eliminate any further risk of accident? The answer given is that they cannot afford it. Therefore, despite what the Minister indicated in his address, there is a limiting factor and that is well known to this Government, otherwise they would be installing these underdays or overways.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: This deals with industrial accidents.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: As a matter of fact, it doesn't. It deals with accidents wherever work is performed. It does not necessarily mean industrial; it could be the man who goes into prune someone's rose bush.

The Hon. H. C Strickland: Is that a worker's industry?

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No, not as the Minister meant it in his interjection. Everyone knows the Minister is thinking of the factory type of industry but this particular section in the Bill intends to extend the scope of the Factories and Shops Act, which would be realised if one read the Act in conjunction with the Bill. The provision is to apply right throughout Western Australia from the northernmost tip to the southernmost tip wherever work of any nature is performed.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: That applies now.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: No, it does not. It applies in shops and factories. Because of the provisions regarding discretionary authority contained in the Bill, power could be given to the Country Women's Association to look after all domestic servants. The farm workers could be handed over to the secretary of the Australian Workers' Union.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: It is a good body.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: Yes, but not to handle this question. An interesting aspect of this particular matter is that the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents in Great Britain presented figures in a recent report illustrating the accident ratio. In this report it was stated that for every one accident occurring at work, there are three accidents in traffic and five accidents at home. Therefore, the proportion of accidents in Great Britain is 1:3:5.

It is extremely hard to get statistics relating to accidents throughout Australia, as the Minister indicated during his speech but, so far as has been ascertained, the figures given at the labour management conference in regard to industrial safety, held at the University a short while ago, showed that the proportion of accidents, attributable to a fault in the machines concerned, was only about 15 per cent., while 85 per cent. were attributable to carelessness on the part of the individual.

It is amazing that recent traffic surveys show that the proportion is much the same in relation to traffic accidents. There the proportion of accidents involving pedestrians and attributable to the motor vehicle is about 15 per cent., while the proportion attributable to the pedestrian is about 85 per cent.; and that raises an interesting facet of the question of safety in factories and shops as at present administered by the factories and shops inspectors.

Practically all the legislation aimed at preventing motor vehicle accidents is directed against the motorist. All the inspections, licensing and so on, relate to the motorist and there is very little control over the pedestrian. In the same way, in industry, the vast bulk of the regulations and inspections are directed against machines. The owner of the factory must comply with a long list of regulations. His machines must be fitted with guards; belting has to be covered; drive shafts must be protected, and there are penalties for the infringement of those and many other provisions.

I understand that there are also provided penalties for the worker for failure to comply with the regulations; but while actions against employers for infringing safety regulations are comparatively common, I have never heard of an action—I have asked those in close contact with the matter and they have never heard of one either—being taken against a workman for infringing safety regulations.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: There are a great many safety regulations in the gold mines and workmen have been prosecuted for infringing them.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: That may be so, and the hon. Mr. Bennetts may tell us later how careful they are on the Goldfields and, if he does so, I believe it will bear out my contention because, considering the dangerous nature of the work, I think the accident rate in that industry is very low. I can speak of factories and shops or workshops only in regard to the industrial shops around the city, in which I have worked. There one finds guards which should be fitted to saws, buzzers, planers and grinders, lying on the floor. Goggles are hung on the grinders, with a notice stating that they should be used—though very often they are not—and on a shelf close by there are provided lenses for the glasses because they quickly become pitted and should then be replaced. But, on nine occasions out of 10, one uses a grinder without bothering to put the guard down or to put on the goggles supplied.

I know of one firm in Perth that went to a great deal of expense and supplied all its staff with glasses. If a worker has to wear spectacles, the lenses for the glasses supplied are made of safety glass and are ground to the prescription of the individual concerned. That firm tried to make its employees wear goggles, but they would not do so; not that they can be altogether blamed for that because goggles are hot and uncomfortable. In spite of all the care that firm has taken and the expense to which it has gone, there is a considerable number of workers' compensation claims against that company, most of them occurring because of small pieces of metal which come in sideways behind the glasses that are supplied and damage the eyes of

the employees concerned. The glasses are not 100 per cent. effective, as they have no guard at the side.

I believe that the quickest way to cut the number of industrial accidents to a minimum would be to instruct the factories and shops inspectors to make surprise checks of the various workshops and prosecute on the spot any workman found not complying with the safety regulations.

The Hon. G. E. Jeffery: The same should apply to the employer.

The Hon. G. C. MacKINNON: There could well be a tightening up in regard to the employer also. In the larger shops, where there are shop stewards or delegates, the conditions are generally fairly good. A modern workshop is generally first class, as there is a tendency to eliminate belting, overhead drives, and so on. The bulk of the machinery has individual motors covered in and protected, although many of the older or back-yard factories could well do with a rigid inspection. In every instance, however, it should cut both ways. If the hon. Mr. Bennetts speaks to the Bill and tells us that that does apply on the Goldfields, I feel positive that an analysis of the figures for accidents in industry there will show that the accident rate is a low one, taking into account the danger involved and the risks incurred in that industry. It would be interesting to have an analysis made of the accident figures there, if the regulations are strictly policed in that industry, and compare the rate with that in industries where only the employer is prosecuted.

I think all doubt should be removed in regard to the question of who is in charge of safety in industry—whether it is the Public Health Department, the Factories and Shops Department, or some other authority. There should be some single authority with the clear power to frame and police the necessary regulations, as considerable confusion exists at present in that regard. Nuisances in relation to odours, dust and so on may be covered by regulations framed by the Public Health Department, while other matters are dealt with by the Factories and Shops Department. All those questions have some bearing on the subject of industrial health and safety, and I see no reason why the administration should not be placed on a firm basis.

There has been talk of a representative body being set up, but about six years ago such a body existed, with representatives of the employees and the workers' compensation people, and with Mr. Chamberlain, as representative of the trade unions. That body lapsed, however, as the trade union representative just did not attend. I understand that he did not attend more than a single meeting of that safety body.

I have been endeavouring to put forward suggestions for the more positive and direct achievement of safety in industry. The Minister for Railways gave a clear example of the need for more thought in this regard when he mentioned a building in St. George's Terrace that is fitted with certain facilities for the cleaning of its many windows. He pointed out that the building in which his office is housed—the S.G.I.O.—has not those facilities; and that is a case of where architects, designing modern buildings, should be taken to task. It has become the habit of architects nowadays to use considerable quantities of glass, —as it is apparently a fascinating material to play with—and many modern buildings are virtually sheathed in glass. When an architect designs a building of that nature, it is only reasonable that he should be requested to bear in mind the necessity for adequate provision for cleaning the glass with a high degree of safety.

It is a great shame that a good example was not set by the S.G.I.O., which is a beautiful building, if one likes vast expanses of glass; but in that instance very few facilities have been provided for the cleaning of the glass; and I think it is a rather poor show. The more consideration we give to this question of worker-safety, the more tangled the skein becomes; and I am positive that there must be more direct ways in which to achieve safety, than by a measure of this nature.

Perhaps, given sufficient time to go into the question thoroughly, it might be possible to devise satisfactory amendments to the Bill, but we have here a measure thrust upon us, requesting us to give to Mr. Warman the power to draft regulations dealing with work wherever it is performed; and for some obscure reason the draftsman of the measure has tossed in a couple of examples—window cleaning and explosive operated power tools. Why they have been included is a matter beyond my comprehension. In view of the wide application of the provisions of this measure—as far as this State is concerned a universal application—there is no justification for its having been presented to us on what we are given to understand is the penultimate day of the session, as that gives us extremely little time in which to consider it. The Bill contains a great many clauses which raise our doubts, despite the obvious, good intentions behind it, and I trust the House will not agree to the second reading.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [5.30]: We have listened to most interesting addresses on this Bill both by the Minister and the hon. Mr. MacKinnon. One might say that the measure can be divided into two important sections, because one deals with the restriction of trading and the other is an attempt to control and prevent accidents by the use

of modern methods in industry. This interests me to a great extent, because years ago—I forget how long—after a great deal of debate in this Chamber, I was fortunate in having this House agree to inserting in the Workers' Compensation Act provisions to allow the Workers' Compensation Board at that time to make a complete study of the causes of accidents. If hon. members will turn to Subsection (13) (a) of Section 29 of the Workers' Compensation Act they will see that the board has power as follows:—

> To investigate all matters relating to industrial diseases of any nature whatsoever and to cause to be made a study of the causes, and the results of varying methods of treatment, of such accidents and diseases, and to publish from time to time such findings and information as, in the opinion of the Board, is in the interests of the proper administration of this Act, and for all or any of such purposes may co-opt not more than three qualified medical practitioners registered under the Medical Act, 1894-1946.

I waited for about two years after that provision was inserted in the Act, but nothing happened and I am still waiting for something to happen. Not once has the Workers' Compensation Board ever used these powers despite the fact that I have raised the matter in this House on more than one occasion.

At that time we had no real known organisation which could be termed a department of industrial health and, in fact, we still have not such a department. Some of the methods and certain procedures evolved in Western Australia are still unsatisfactory.

Some warehouse proprietors are making tremendous efforts to assist and safeguard their workers from accidents, but, on the other hand, it is quite obvious the precautions taken in other instances are inadequate. I say that from the knowledge I have of the cases that exist. I understand that just recently an attempt was made by the Department of Public Health to become interested in industrial health. Already, it has appointed a medical officer to carry out work in this field. He has just returned from New South Wales in which State there is a most adequate Department of Industrial Health. Whilst in that State, this medical officer underwent some post graduate training. It is an extension of that type of work which is going to assist in the prevention of accidents and which will achieve a great deal more than the writing of do's and don'ts into various Acts.

I am sorry to digress a little from the views expressed by the hon. Mr. MacKinnon, because I am so often impressed by the breadth of his knowledge. However, on this occasion one must accept the dictum of a very great man in regard to the prevention of accidents, and it is that *nothing will succeed* which calls upon the worker to take part in the prevention of accidents. Apparently that is the basis of human nature. It does not matter what precautions are taken to safeguard the individual, because the individual, in the main, will not take part in any move for the prevention of accidents.

Therefore, any precautionary measure that is taken for the benefit of the worker must be effected by research into methods which will result in the worker being able to use whatever tool is at hand without being in any way responsible for the prevention of accidents. I will quote an outstanding example. One of the greatest problems that has existed in the building industry for a long time has been in relation to painters developing serious complaints. Some years ago, in conjunction with Mr. White, the then secretary of the Painters and Decorators' Union, I took part in an exhaustive study of the health of painters in this State.

However, in the ultimate, because of a small legal technicality, we lost our claim. It was realised then that there was only one solution to the problem and that was to do away forever with the use of lead in paint. That meant that the whole of the question concerning the use of lead in paint and the prevention of accidents or ill-health of the individual arising from the use of lead in paint was taken out of the hands of the worker by the manufacturers substituting zinc and other metals in the paint instead of lead.

The basis for the prevention of accidents, therefore, is to take away from the worker the need for his taking precautions and, before doing so, alter the mechanism in such a way as to make accidents less likely. Some time ago, in the gold mines at Kalgoorlie, Dr. Radcliffe-Taylor made a survey of injuries to the big toe, because such an injury has a very damaging effect. It makes walking very difficult and often produces arthritis and a rigid toe. So, Dr. Radcliffe-Taylor devised boots with a steel cap to be worn by the miners, but she had no success whatsoever in her endeavours to persuade the men to use them. The men may use them now, but I am sure it must have taken years for them to realise their value. At that time Dr. Radcliffe-Taylor was a medical officer in the State Government Insurance Office. Therefore, the best approach to the prevention of acidents in industry must be along the lines of making sure that accidents cannot occur to the worker.

There must be some cases, of course, where we have to say to the worker, "You must observe certain rules and regulations," but at the same time one must be conscious of any regulation that one

imposes. For example, if one makes a worker wear a mask and he becomes faint due to lack of oxygen as a result of wearing it and then falls, the accident has been caused by the imposition of a protective device. Therefore, it is not as easy as it sounds to say that a worker shall observe the regulation imposed for his protection.

If the Government does not introduce a measure of this kind, I would prefer to see built up an organisation of industrial health within, say, another department, but steps would have to be taken along the lines that I respectfully suggested when I introduced the amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act and which relevant section I have already read to the House. For instance, I do not believe that a factory inspector is competent enough to draw up suitable regulations. He would have to be a super man with a great deal of knowledge to be able to cover the whole of the State and to draft regulations for, say, the use of any tools.

However, if there were an organisation set up which could—by people working in industry giving their advice in regard to the framing of regulations—carry out specific prevention of accidents, we would achieve the Government's desire sought by this measure. The only real objection I have to the first part of the Bill is the polyglot mass of words which appear on page 4 and which provide for an amendment to Section 58 of the principal Act. Those words read as follows:—

> Require any matter to which the regulations relate to be in accordance with the specified requirement, or as approved by, or to the satisfaction of, a specified person or body, or specified class of person or body, or so as to delegate to, or confer on, a specified person or body or class of person or body, a discretionary authority.

What exactly does that mean? That type of loose wording should not appear in any legislation that is to go on our statute book. Whilst some of the other clauses may be necessary, surely that one is not.

The principal factor is that there shall be at the head of industry an organisation thoroughly skilled in the attempted prevention of accidents. Such an organisation would achieve a great deal more than Bills of this nature. I realise that this measure is an attempt to avoid accidents that might be caused by working with modern pieces of machinery, and, having that in mind, it is perhaps a good suggestion, but I am not altogether happy about the method proposed to implement it.

Not only do I disagree with the second part of the Bill, but also, it completely arouses my ire. It is one of those provisions that are thrown at us every now and then to restrict the hours of trading. Hon. members know by now that I will not support a Bill that proposes to restrict trading hours. I remember one of the first two occasions when a wholesale warehouse kept open at night to allow the big cash and carry stores to replenish their stock in the evening. Within a short time I began to realise that other warehouses that were supplying goods other than edible commodities, were beginning to wonder whether they should keep open at night. Then they began to say to themselves, "This is only damaging our business" and they decided that they did not like this move and would appreciate a Bill to amend the Act to restrict the hours of trading.

This Bill is similar to the Bill that was introduced by the Minister for Industrial Development in regard to hire-purchase. If we allow this trend to continue we will find that the wholesale warehousemen will come along to us and say, "No, we do not want this Bill" because they will realise that this is a trend that must gain impetus with modern methods of handling merchandise. Recently, I spoke to one or two of my friends who told me that I should vote for this measure, but after a couple of minutes' discussion with them on the Bill, I came away wondering whether they really did want me to vote for it. In my opinion I do not think they have given serious thought to the matter.

The other day the question was raised as to whether there should be a parking place laid out on one of the city streets, and four doctors who were attending the Mount Hospital for the purpose of treating their patients were told that there would be no specific parking area laid out for any particular individual. That made me laugh because in many of the city streets there are areas reserved for parking so that people in business may be able to park their trucks and manoeuvre them in the streets. So whilst one section of the community is denied the right to have an area laid out on which to park their vehicles, another section has had half the city laid out for them as parking areas.

For instance, we find that even the taxicabs have spaces marked out for them, which they can occupy as business sites. How long is that going to last? It cannot last very long. What will happen is that these warehouses—and I am not only restricting it to the cash and carry businesses and the big emporiums, but to most of the shops—will have to be serviced outside trading hours. It is quite obvious, therefore, that we cannot carry on an ancient practice for life in this city; we cannot stop at 5 o'clock in the evening. Somebody must work extraordinary hours—if hon. members would like it put that way—in order to deliver to the smaller places, and the bigger emporiums, goods on a wholesale basis, so as to enable them to carry on trade next day.

One has only to think for a moment that if all the yellow areas that are marked exclusively for trade vehicles, were taken away from the city, there would be more parking room. At the moment when one tries to find parking space in the city, one discovers that more than half the space is booked for trucks.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Is the hon. member speaking to the Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill or the Traffic Act Amendment Bill, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT: I trust that the hon. member will get back to the measure before the House.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I thought the Minister had been listening to me. I do not know whether he wants me to go over it all again. To my mind this is vitally associated with the parking regulations; they go hand in hand.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: This is the measure that deals with shops and factories.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I realise that the Minister does not understand, but I cannot help it.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I do not understand your references to traffic and parking regulations.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: What we must understand, and what the Minister must realise, is that because the traffic in the city has grown at such an unprecedented rate it became obvious to the warehouses that they had to supply goods outside the ordinary trading hours. I think hon. members will find I am right when I say that the people will welcome the removal of the areas set aside for trucks in city streets, so that business can continue.

There would be no necessity for those areas if most of the supplies to the emporiums and shops were made outside normal business hours. I think it would be a retrograde step to say to these people, "You must go back; you must only allow trade to take place in the ordinary trading hours of daylight, from 9 to 5." A policy such as that would hold up progress in this city for many years to come. If the businessmen of the city thought over this matter for a short while they would realise that what I suggest is a progressive move, which would increase their business, and make shopping and business facilities in the city and suburbs much easier, and more profitable.

THE HON. R. C. MATTISKE (Metropolitan) [5.50]: I am going to oppose this measure, because I feel that although the question of accidents in industry is an extremely important matter, the manner in which this Bill proposes to deal with it is not the correct approach. Apart from that, I do not think we have sufficient time to give thorough consideration and investigation to this matter, to enable us to pass appropriate legislation at this late stage of the session.

I was interested in certain opinions expressed by the hon. Dr. Hislop. Of particular interest did I find his suggestion that a better method of approach to the problem would be the creation of a body to investigate accidents in industry, and to assist in the framing of regulations to control those accidents. I must disagree with the hon. Dr. Hislop, because I do not think that is the solution to the problem. I feel that the solution lies more in the education of those directly concerned with the accidents. As an example, perhaps I should refer to what possibly might be the most hazardous industries in Australia at the present time; namely, the steel industry and the mining industry.

Recently, while conducting investigations into the steel industry, I was particularly impressed with the methods by which attempts were made to counter accidents in that industry. When dealing with white hot billets of steel which throw off sparks, or when dealing with other sections of steel which are travelling, in many cases, at very high speeds, or when dealing with the dipping of certain partly manufactured articles there is, of course, always the danger of accident. But the accident level in that industry is kept to a surprisingly low figure and the way this is done is by lecturing to the individuals concerned in the various phases of the industry on the means by which accidents can be avoided, and by encouraging the employees to avoid accidents by continuously drawing close attention to the dangers.

One can see displayed in prominent places throughout the various steelworks, huge boards showing man-hours or man-days lost through accidents over particular periods. In certain places the works are divided into sections, and one section competes against the other in an endeavour to secure the best figure for the month. The team which has the best result for the month is given encouragement by way of bonus.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Don't you think the research department has had anything to do with that?

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: It may have, but I feel that one body would not be competent to deal with all the industries concerned in the State. In the case of the steel industry, it behoved those directly concerned with production to put their own house in order, and in that case it was done to great purpose. The persons employing labour are the losers if certain men go off through accidents; they would definitely be losing production. So it is in their direct

interest to make sure that the accident rate is cut down to absolute bedrock. By giving the men encouragement in the form of bonuses, and creating a competitive spirit in the different sections of work, very valuable efforts are being made to do this.

The same applies in the mining industry, in the mines of the Electrolytic Zinc Corporation at Broken Hill, I have seen methods adopted similar to those I have mentioned already, in an endeavour to restrict accidents. That is very commendable. The mere promulgation of regulations saying that one must do this, and must not do that, is not the answer. I think that pointing out quite forcibly, but at the same time in a pleasant manner, to those directly concerned what the result of their negligence could mean, is by far a better and more practical approach to the question.

The hon. Mr. MacKinnnon mentioned the fact that certain employees did not carry out their responsibilities in the prevention of accidents, and the hon. Dr. Hislop also recited incidents where that was the case. I agree entirely that in many cases human nature seems to revolt at regulation, and for that reason, I stress the point that it is better to encourage rather than drive.

The proposal in the Bill is far too sweeping but, at the same time, I think it will do a lot of good, in that it will stimulate thought on this very important matter. Even though this Bill might be rejected, as I hope it will, because I do not think it is the proper answer to the problem, I hope that at least the attention of hon. members will be directed to this matter to such an extent that they will all give it careful consideration during the recess period; that they will conduct investigations into the various industries in which they may be interested, so that something of value may arise out of it during the next session of Parliament.

So far as the second aspect of the Bill is concerned—that which deals with the restriction of trading hours for the wholesale grocery trade—I feel that, too, is entirely wrong in its approach. I must agree entirely with the hon. Dr. Hislop that the trend these days should not be towards a restriction of trading hours but to the lengthening of the span of trading hours. I repeat what I have said previously that by this I do not mean an increase in the working week of any individual, but the spread of trading over a longer period.

I think the traffic problem is directly connected with this aspect of the Bill, and if certain retail grocers are able to pick up their supplies from warehouses at hours other than peak periods, or through the daytime, encouragement should be given to them; and I feel the move on the part of the particular wholesalers who have commenced this type of action is worthy of commendation. I am somewhat surprised at the Minister for criticising this aspect, because it will help to reduce the cost to the small retailer by permitting him to come in in his own vehicle, outside trading hours, to select goods he particularly wants for his shop. It will help him to keep his costs down.

The person who gets the benefit of that is the one who most thoroughly deserves it, namely, the man whose income is restricted to the extent that it is necessary for him to pay particular attention to where his groceries and other foodstuffs come from, because he must get them at the lowest price. When dealing with the unfair trading Act, mention was made of preferential discounts. It was said that was an unfair method of trading, and that it enabled the chain stores—including chain grocery stores—to place the smaller man at a disability. I venture to say that this Bill will put the small man at a disadvantage.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: I could not agree with you more.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: If by giving extended hours he is able to keep costs down, I think it is a good thing and should be encouraged. For those reasons, I feel that the Bill is not a good form of legislation and, therefore, I cannot support the second reading. However, I hope the Government will continue to give very close attention to accidents in industry and that it will confer with the leaders of various sections of the different industries so that their views and recommendations may be taken into account. If they are, there may be certain conditions existing in one industry which can be applied to others. Therefore, the Government should take action to spread that good work so that accidents may be kept to an absolute bedrock.

THE HON. G. E. JEFFERY (Suburban) [6.2]: I shall be brief in supporting this measure. I do not intend to speak on the question of the hours of traders and warehouses, as most of the previous speakers have covered that section to the fullest extent.

Whilst I support the measure, I believe that Parliament will have to legislate for somewhere between where freedom ends and licence takes its place. As stated by the Minister, and as a result of my experience with businessmen who have approached me on this subject, I can say that they have no desire to remain open the hours they are compelled to by reason of the activities of some of their competitors.

However, the angle with which I am particularly concerned is that of industrial safety. My experience in industry dates back to what one might call the "bad old

days" and what was considered a more enlightened industrial era. From my own experience I can say that often the operative is just as much to blame as the executive; although in some cases the executive is more to blame than the operative.

For a period, I served as secretary of the Industrial Safety Committee within the industry in which I worked; and it might be interesting for hon. members to know that the Chief Inspector of Factories and his officers assisted me to perform the duties of administration. That department has built up quite a good library which, no doubt, could be improved; and I think the hon. Dr. Hislop was on the right track when he said that something should be done about this legislation. There should also be an officer possessing some technical ability.

It is easy to make regulations in a general sense, the powers of which seem wise at the time, but experience shows that they do not work equally well in different places. The hon. Dr. Hislop hit the nail on the head when he referred to the wearing of masks.

I worked in an industry where the wearing of masks was often required, and the stage was reached where it was not safe to wear the mask. The same applies to the provision of glasses in the case of grinding machines. I have been in industrial factories where the grinding machines were most suitably placed for operation. However, I have been in others where the machines were within six feet of a blacksmith's forge. It is necessary that the operators of grinding machines should use glasses as otherwise there is always a danger of injury to the eyes. One disadvantage of having to wear glasses is that the lenses become pitted and obscured after a time, and must be renewed, and also, in the hot weather, they tend to become misted.

The regulations are necessary; but they do not always work out as well as one would expect because of the different circumstances in different places of employment. The men who use these machines are good judges of the advantages and disadvantages, from the safety angle, and I am sure a lot of employers would agree that because of the work of the Safety Committee fewer accidents have taken place simply because of the provision of small improvements such as guards, ventilation and lighting for machinery. I think statistics will prove my belief that accidents are more often than not caused by the monotony of a job where the operative is processing one article for a great length of time without any change of occupation. Mental fatigue then plays a big part.

I think, too, it is necessary to cater for the window cleaner. Where I have worked in industry, I have seen workmen try to make a good impression on the master; and I have seen cases where scaffolding has not been of the required standard. In order to impress the master, the workmen have put the scaffolding up in two hours, whereas the proper time should have been six hours. There is a balance there between the provision of safety facilities in industry and the actual work.

It is very necessary that a conscientious employee should have the safety to which he is entitled; but his fellow worker who skips the regulation is able to produce a job in a much lesser period of time. To the master, who has not a full knowledge of his worker, this creates the impression that where one man is taking only six hours to do a job, the other takes eight. All these factors come into the matter.

It has been suggested that one of the reasons why some industries have a very high safety standard is that they employ inspectors who are specialists in the particular industry; plus the fact that when accidents do occur they are generally fatal. I have seen men over a period of years proceed to work under the conditions I have mentioned in regard to scaffolding. I have also had the sad duty of going to a man's home and consoling his widow because of the fact that he has been killed at work.

I think the enlightened employer will go the full distance in regard to safety measures; and I agree with the hon. Mr. Mattiske that the enlightened employer stands to gain more by providing safety facilities than by ignoring them.

The finest precaution I have seen in industry is the formation of safety committees within the various works. They all receive first rate assistance from the Factories and Shops Department in the provision of text books and the latest findings on industrial research for safety throughout Australia and other parts of the world. I think the answer is to be found in places like the Midland Workshops, where there is a very good safety set up. The Bill could well be passed on the safety angle alone, even if its powers are used only in regard to explosive tools and window cleaners. With those few remarks I support the measure.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North—in reply) [6.9]: I am pleased to hear one hon. member supporting this measure. I am of the opinion that this Bill has been opposed on very weak grounds, particularly against its main provision in regard to the prevention of accidents.

While this responsibility rests all along the line with the worker, hon. members desire to examine the question during the recess. That might be all right; but it is not only the worker who is involved in this matter; there is also the manufacturer.

I pointed out in my introductory speech that the cost is very high to all concerned when industrial accidents occur; and surely it must be an improvement if the Act can be amended to prevent such accidents.

The hon. Mr. Mattiske says that it is too late in the session to give careful consideration to the Bill. The hon. Mr. MacKinnon says, "We want more information." I cannot see that it takes very much thought to insert into this portion of the Act a provision which will enable special regulations to be made which will have the effect of protecting workers from tools which may not come to the required standard. They may be using tools which are of a dangerous nature; or maybe using them in a dangerous way. The hon. Mr. MacKinnon says that we have thrown in a few explosive machines and so on, together with window cleaners. Why? For the same reason that other machines and dangerous gases are prescribed for under the Act; if not this Act, some other industrial Act.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: These accidents are outside that sort of cover.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Nothing of the kind. The hon. member would convince himself on that point; but I doubt it very much. He is very studious in relation to Acts and Bills, and I cannot believe that he has satisfied himself. All the Bill desires to do in relation to industrial accidents is to amend Section 55, and describe the type of machine or where the accident may occur. If the hon. member read Section 55, he would know very well that it does not apply universally to farmers or to anything that happens throughout the State.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I could argue about that.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I will read Section 55 which says that where the Minister is satisfied that the manufacture, plant, process or description of manual labour used in factories is dangerous or injurious to health or dangerous to life or limb, whether generally or in the case of women, and so on, he can make regulations. However, before these regulations have any effect he has to do many things. The subsection says—

> Before the Governor makes any regulations under this section the Minister, having regard to such related matters as he thinks fit but having regard in any case to such expenditure, such local conditions and such circumstances as are reasonably likely to be involved in the application of the regulations shall consider the draft of the regulations and shall publish in a newspaper circulating in the district or districts in which the factories as aforesaid exist and in such other manner as he may think best adapted for informing persons affected, notice of the proposal to make the regulations and of the place where copies of the draft regulations may be obtained.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It is covered in all directions.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The subsection continues—

> Every objection must be in writing and state—
>
> (a) the draft regulations or portions of draft regulations objected to;
>
> (b) the specific grounds of objection; and
>
> (c) the omissions, additions, or modifications asked for.

The Act itself covers the very point raised by the hon. Mr. Mattiske that there should be consultation with employers and everybody concerned. The Act says this must happen.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Before tea I was explaining the effects of Section 55 (1) (2) of the Act. This section makes provision for special regulations to deal with protective measures concerning hazards which confront industrial workers in certain industries. I say "certain industries" because when the hon. Mr. MacKinnon referred to Section 55 he considered that the amendment to it would cover the whole State; even to the extent of covering farm workers. That is not so, because the definition of "factory" specifically lays down just what a "factory" means in relation to the Act. It also lays down what is not considered to be a factory. The definition of "factory" means and includes, for the purposes of this Act—

> Any building, premises or place in which four or more persons are engaged directly or indirectly in any handicraft, or in preparing or manufacturing goods for trade or sale, and includes any building, premises or place in which one or more persons are so engaged as paid employees for the purpose of the employer's trade or business, but does not include any building in course of erection nor any temporary workshop or shed for workmen engaged in the erection of such building.

The amendment, when it says, "wherever used, whether in factories or elsewhere" is included for the purpose of covering those persons who may be using explosive tools on the erection of a building. That does not necessarily mean the initial erection of a factory building, but an extension of it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You reckon that "elsewhere" is limited to those places?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It says "elsewhere." Section 55, if the amendment is agreed to, will read—

> Where the Minister is satisfied that any manufacture, plant, process, or description of manual labour wherever used, whether in factories or elsewhere, is dangerous.

The object behind the amendment is to make special provision for factories.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: You had better put a flea in the ear of your draftsman because this does not fit your meaning very well.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The hon. member might not be satisfied with the way it is drafted. So that consideration might be given to this matter during the recess, I am prepared to forego the amendment to Section 55. It is covered in Clause 5 which appears on page 2 of the Bill. I would be prepared not to proceed with paragraphs (a) and (b) of the clause. This would mean that Section 55 (1) would be left as it is.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: I think that is fair enough.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I point out that the definition of "factory" which I have already read, is very wide. Subsection (2) provides that—

> Any building, premises, or place in which a person or persons of the Chinese or Asiatic race is or are so engaged.

The definition of "factory" also includes—

(4) any bakehouse;

(5) any building, premises or place in which articles or goods which are intended for human consumption are manufactured or prepared for sale, but shall not include the kitchen of any shop of the class mentioned in the Fourth Schedule;

(6) any building, premises or place in which electrical energy is generated or transformed as an illuminant or a motive power for trade or sale or in which coal gas or any other form of gas is produced for the like purpose;

(7) any laundry, (meaning thereby every building, premises or place where laundry work is performed for hire or reward) whether the persons engaged therein receive payment or not; and

(8) any claypit or quarry worked in connection with and occupied by the occupier of any pottery or brickyard;

Then it goes on to say that the term "factory" does not include a multitude of places, and it lists prisons, industrial or reformatory schools, buildings or premises in which the occupier manufactures or prepares dairy produce; any ship, and so on. Specifically excluded from the term "factory" are any buildings, premises or places used exclusively for pastoral, agricultural, vineyard or garden purposes.

So when the hon. Mr. MacKinnon referred to farms, he was right off the beam. Mines and collieries are excluded. I see no reason why it should take several months to consider whether persons working under the provisions of the Factories and Shops Act should be covered or be given the opportunity to be covered by regulations which will ensure that the element of risk which they face in their duties will be minimised as far as possible.

I remind the Council again that before the Governor may make the regulations, the regulations must be published in a newspaper circulating throughout the district concerned. This is a most unusual procedure. Even if the regulations are agreed to, Parliament has an opportunity to disallow them. I see no reason why more time than is available should be required in which to consider this aspect. It is not right to say there is insufficient time to consider the legislation. If the hon. members who hold that view are going to adopt it when further legislation comes here this session, we might finish very early tonight. Is it reasonable or logical to suggest that there is not time to consider the matter?

It is easy, in the dying hours of the session, to sympathise with a measure and then say it has arrived here too late. Although not wishing to anticipate the attitude members might take, I think there is one Bill to come here a little later that will not require much consideration. I suggest a little more thought could be given to the particular aspect I have raised in connection with industrial accidents and their prevention. This is a matter of prevention and nothing else.

Dealing with the warehouse side, it has been said that this is a means of supplying goods to small shopkeepers, and so on. Of course it is; there is no argument about that. I pointed out when introducing the measure that if goods are supplied outside the normal hours, the cost to the supplier must be more than if they are supplied during the normal working hours, because the supplier has to pay penalty rates.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Do you remember that when we were dealing with the regulations covering backing in and out, it was envisaged that because those regulations were to take effect, deliveries might have to be made at night.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The Bill does not prohibit all deliveries. Trading is the only thing that worries the Government, and it worries it for the simple reason that it will be detrimental to a large number of small shopkeepers.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Who want to go and get their goods at night.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: If I understand the hon. member's previous interjection, he said that the tendency of his party was not to restrict private enterprise.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You understand the interjection incorrectly. I said the tendency was not to restrict but to enlarge trading hours.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Not to restrict them?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: No; not to restrict trading hours but to enlarge them.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Did you say trading, or trading hours?

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Trading hours.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I must have heard the hon. member wrongly.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: You often do.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I thought the hon. member said the tendency was not to restrict trading. Earlier we heard him advocating a restriction on the issue of taxi plates. Whether that can be termed trade or trading, I do not know. I suggest that by bringing warehouse trading hours—not delivery hours, but the hours for the selling of goods to customers—outside of the trading hours which apply to the smaller shops, we will be placing the smaller shops at a disadvantage.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: How?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Because they will be closed while the others are open.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: This is dealing with wholesalers.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Yes; but wholesale can become retail. I understand that there are some instances of where that is a fact.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: The Factories and Shops Department deals with that.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The hon. Dr. Hislop said that he did not support a restriction of trade. We do not want to restrict trade; we want to regulate it. I think the principal of organised marketing, regulated marketing, or call it what we like, is the soundest principle we can have. If the tendency is to extend the hours of trading, I am afraid that the price of goods must increase, because penalty rates must be paid.

The Hon. L. C. Diver: The wheatgrower is working 16 hours a day now.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I do not know what hours wheatgrowers are working; but if they are working 16 hours a day they will be getting paid for it. Every award lays down that after certain hours a higher rate shall be paid. The point is that that must increase costs; it will not reduce them. Surely that is elementary!

If the Bill, which is in two parts, does not meet with the approval of members, I suggest that at least the part through which protection will be provided against industrial accidents be agreed to; but I trust that the House will accept the Bill as it stands.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—10

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. G. E. Jeffery
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. W. R. Hall	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. J. D. Teahan
	(Teller.)

Noes—14

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. G. C. MacKinnon
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
	(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. A. R. Jones
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. J. Murray

Majority against—4.

Question thus negatived.

Bill defeated.

PLANT DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by the Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Minister for Industrial Development), read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (Minister for Industrial Development—North) [7.50] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is for the purpose of amending those sections in the Plant Diseases Act which give the Minister power to raise finance to combat fruit-fly infestation, and to establish fruit-fly baiting schemes; and it deals with an amendment to Section 39C of the original Act. Fees for the registration of orchards are laid down and, for registration and transfer of the registration, the fee is 2s., and other registration fees may be graded from 2s. 6d. upwards, according to the area.

A separate amendment, arising from Section 39C was made in 1939, and was known as the Plant Diseases (Registration Fees) Act. Section 39C remained unaltered. Over the past two years fruit-fly infestation has caused wide-spread damage over the entire State, and growers have indicated their concern at the inadequate fees available under the provisions of the Act, and their willingness to pay higher registration fees, and higher contributions from their trust fund, in order that greater efforts can be made to reduce the incidence of the pest.

This Bill provides for an increase in registration fees for commercial orchards of one acre or more from 2s. to 5s.; and an increase for non-commercial orchards, of 25 trees or more, from 2s. to 5s.; and the aggregate of those fees, and the trust fund of the W.A. Fruit Growers' Association, to be subsidised by the Government on a £ for £ basis. The specific section in the Plant Diseases Act dealing with fruit-fly baiting was assented to in January 1947; and conditions are laid down in that Act for the taking of polls, the formation of committees and the maximum fees for both commercial and backyard orchards. Several amendments have been made since—in September, 1949, November, 1950 and December, 1954; and the last amendment varied the baiting charges for both commercial and backyard orchards.

The sections covered under the present Bill are Section 12C (a) concerning the discontinuance or otherwise of a baiting scheme in existence, and Section 12C (v) and (1) (c); that paragraph deals with the charge for the baiting of backyard orchards. With respect to the section governing the fruit-fly baiting scheme, the Act at present provides for Government subsidies for baiting schemes which are limited to a period of operation of three years when, at the expiration of that time, the continuance of the scheme is decided by a new poll of registered growers.

This provision, together with a lack of funds, has had the effect of restricting the effectiveness of the scheme by terminating the operation prematurely, in some cases, and not enabling new and desirable action to be taken. It has been the experience of the department that baiting schemes are handicapped by the large number of backyard orchards to be treated, and the costs involved are greater for this service, because of the separate locations of the gardens. The maximum baiting charges provided for under the Act are insufficient to cover costs. This factor was instrumental in the scheme ceasing to operate owing to a shortage of finance before the commercial fruit season had ended, and when fruit-fly infestation was still a problem.

The proposed amendment, therefore, is to ensure a greater degree of permanency for the fruit-fly baiting schemes by providing that the discontinuance of a scheme, after the initial three-year period, can only arise when at least ten per cent. of the registered growers eligible to vote request the Minister to hold another poll. I think that is a very unlikely circumstance.

The Bill also provides that baiting charges on non-commercial orchards be doubled to enable the financing of baiting schemes for a longer period, and the Bill is designed to give the Minister power under the Act, to raise additional fees and to effect the more permanent establishment of the fruit-fly baiting schemes for the purpose of waging a more effective campaign against the pest.

It can be said that when the original Plant Diseases Act of 1914 was subsequently amended in 1933, 1935, and 1939, the concentration at the time was placed on the dire effects fruit-fly was having in the 1930's on the local as well as the export trade. I had the responsibility of introducing that legislation and endeavouring to convince overseas buyers of many of our fruits, including apples and oranges, in Ceylon and Singapore, that we would take the strictest measures to control the situation in Western Australia. But the position has seriously deteriorated since that time. In case some hon. members wish to know just how competent it will be to carry out this work, I would like to indicate that the fund at present represents £8,350; the commercial growers under this legislation will contribute an additional £4,000, and the non-commercial orchardists £750, making a total of £13,100. That will be supplemented by the Government on a £ for £ basis to ensure that there will be greater concentration and continuity of the work. I move—

That the Bill now be read a second time.

THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT (South-West) [7.58]: I am very pleased at the introduction of this amendment to the Plant Diseases Act, although, as hon. members are probably aware, because of what I said during the Address-in-reply Debate, the legislation does not go as far as I would like to see it go. As the Minister has just indicated, the commercial growers of this State have said, quite plainly, that they are willing to have their fees increased and, in fact, they are being increased to the amount to which they agreed at their annual conference. At that conference it was also proposed that non-commercial orchard registration fees be increased to £1. However, the Government has not agreed to go that far.

On examining the figures read out by the Minister relating to the amount by which the fees will be increased, it will be seen that the Government will contribute £13,100, which is a little more than double the amount the Government was asked by me to contribute. I would sooner see this contribution loaded on to the non-commercial growers, because from their trees mainly comes the infestation. Of the increased charges, the commercial growers will pay an extra £4,000, and the non-commercial growers will pay an extra £750.

The Hon. H. K. Watson: That is negligible.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: The increase payment by the non-commercial orchards is negligible. Up to this time

non-commercial growers have been contributing a fairly large sum, in comparison with the contributions made by the commercial growers. Of course, the number of non-commercial growers far exceeds the number of commercial growers.

It is obvious the department is still thinking in terms of control, and not of eradication. From the figures which have just been read out by the Minister it appears that the total collections, including the Government £ for £ subsidy, will bring in £26,200. That amount added to the £11,600, which was collected under the existing scale of fees, will bring in an amount of £37,800. Admittedly this means a little more than £18,000 extra for fruit-fly control, as compared with last year. I think this increased amount will go a long way towards control measures, but it will not be sufficient to enable the implementation of eradication measures.

I am thankful for the consideration given by the Government to this matter. Generally speaking, the fruitgrowers are very reasonable in their attitude towards the Bill, although they prefer to see a more intense eradication campaign launched. If this Bill can bring about the control of fruit-fly in the metropolitan area, then the Government might give consideration to the thought of complete eradication. I am personally of the opinion that in the long view, it is cheaper to adopt eradication measures than to spend these large sums of money on control measures. It is contended by some officers of the department that eradication is not possible. I disagree. I think it is possible if tackled in the right way. Some of them think in terms of eradicating the fruit-fly at this point of time when it is very prevalent. They forget that there are years in which the incidence of fruit-fly, even without any control measure, is small. That is because of the unfavourable season.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: The natural host presents a difficulty.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: The natural host in a district like Bridgetown will carry the fruit-fly in favourable years. In unfavourable years it will not. The colder the weather, the longer is the life cycle of the fruit-fly. In the years of unfavourable seasons the incidence of fruit-fly is greatly restricted. It is my contention that during a year of unfavourable season, eradication measures should be implemented.

I am in entire agreement with the provision which seeks to extend the three-year period of the committee, until such time as 10 per cent. of the registered growers in any declared eradication area ask for a poll to be taken. I agree with the Minister that it is most unlikely they will ask for a poll. It is just as well, because it is quite fruitless to have an area controlled, where a compulsory baiting scheme operates for three years, and then discontinued. In that event the money spent would be wasted.

There is not much more I need say on this Bill. The provision for doubling the baiting charges is self explanatory. It does not provide for a heavy charge where compulsory baiting schemes are carried on. I support the second reading.

THE HON. L. C. DIVER (Central) [8.7]: I support this measure. My view is that orchardists in this State are fortunate in that the Minister in charge of the Bill is a man who has been trained in agricultural science. No doubt he has a keener appreciation of Bills of this type than have many other hon. members. Whilst I know he is not the Minister for Agriculture, with his knowledge of agriculture I believe that as time goes on a more realistic approach will be taken towards the backyard fruit trees.

I know that you, Mr. President, are interested in backyard fruit trees. Every hon. member who grows fruit trees in his backyard knows that at the present time the growing of fruit trees in the backyard is an unprofitable investment. Today they have become a liability through the incidence of fruit-fly. Irrespective of the attention given to backyard fruit trees, I have yet to meet any person who has combated the fruit-fly successfully in his backyard.

If that is the case with people who adopt energetic and sensible measures of control, what must be the position of the thousands of backyard orchardists who do not take any control measures, and who allow the fruit to fall on the ground where the flies breed by the million?

I hark back to one of my first speeches in this House regarding the giving of power to an inspector to uproot fruit trees which had become infested. The time is fast approaching when that proposal ought to be adopted. If the Minister cannot prevail upon the Government to take steps in that direction, then we can only wait for that state of affairs to come about in the process of evolution.

I know the Minister in charge of this Bill will adopt a different slant on the question of backyard fruit trees, somewhat along the lines I have suggested. Where the owner of backyard fruit trees does not implement control measures for the eradication of fruit-fly, then the inspector should be given the power to have the trees destroyed.

The people who apply eradication measures in their backyards will not need any officer of the department to tell them to destroy the trees when they become infested. They will do that themselves. For the sake of the commercial orchardist and the export fruit industry of this State,

it is highly desirable that some worthwhile attempt be made to eradicate the fruit-fly in backyards.

We all realise that the problem does not rest there. We realise there are host plants, and a neglected rose bush is one of them. I possess a nice rose bush, but regularly I cut off the old buds, and thus destroy a host for the fruit-fly. There is no reason why every home gardener should not do the same thing.

I do not wish to go over the position in regard to the increase in registration fees of commercial and non-commercial orchards. The increases have been clearly explained by the Minister. No commercial grower has any complaint to make in this respect.

In regard to the appointment of committees to control the fruit-fly baiting scheme in their districts, there have been complaints raised. The necessity to introduce legislation which provides that a committee, once elected, will run for a minimum of three years, and will continue until another election takes place, shows the apathy of many people in the industry. Very few people complain about the compulsion involved in those schemes. The fact that there is a minimum period shows there is not sufficient interest taken by the industry to ensure that a reasonable percentage of the registered growers will vote. The growers will not come along on polling day to elect a committee.

The time will come when this vote will become a compulsory vote; everyone who has registration will be expected to go along and record his vote, otherwise—if he cannot give a reasonable excuse for not doing so—his licence will be withdrawn. That would be the answer to those few men who complain about the compulsory fruit-fly baiting scheme. Every bit of complaint would vanish because I have no doubt that such an overwhelming majority would vote in favour of it that the Minister for Agriculture would not get the irritating correspondence that he receives from time to time, and the committee that conducts these various fruit-fly baiting schemes would know that it had the support of the vast majority of growers. Before concluding, I would like to submit another proposition with regard to the backyard fruit trees and that is that it would be interesting if the department were to keep a register of the age of the trees in many of the backyard orchards.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: They could be given a birthday party.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: It is pretty obvious that I am in too deep water for the hon. member.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: In too big a tree.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: He does not appreciate the seriousness of the subject before the House. In a number of instances, I feel that it would be found that the novelty wears off with a lot of these backyard fruitgrowers. They lose the incentive and the trees do not get the necessary attention. It would give us an excellent indication as to how legislation for the future should be drafted. If we knew the age of the trees, it would give us an indication as to how many people look after a tree for a while and then neglect it, after which the fruit-fly infests it. With those few comments, I support this measure.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [8.19]: I would like to congratulate the Government in making some move to control this pest but I frankly believe there will be no real success until the backyard orchard in the metropolitan area is attacked. I am disappointed that some scheme has not been evolved—and it may be due entirely to shortage of finance—based on the Argentine ant scheme, by which the whole of the known orchards in the metropolitan area would be effectively sprayed. I do not think the lack of spraying is due entirely to the fact that the individual who has a fruit tree in his backyard is negligent, but because he is not sure of himself when it comes to spraying the tree. He does not know whether his method will be efficient.

The Hon. F. D. Willmott: He is quite often not sure that he is able to spray.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: And he is also, to a large extent, rather scared of the modern sprays.

The Hon. E. M. Davies: He has every right to be.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: A lot do not like spraying with malathion and so on, and unless they know how to use such sprays they think it better to refrain from doing so. I do not see how we are going to make any real progress unless we attack the problem with the same energy with which the Argentine ant scheme was tackled. I would stress that I think we are preventing the growth of what could be a very real industry in this State. I believe Western Australia can grow good fruit, and that there should be a ready market all round our doors for it.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: There is a terrific market locally for canned fruit.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: But we do not grow the right fruit.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: But it could be developed.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: It would not be very much good while we still had this scourge. But if we made up our minds, we could build up a big industry. South Australia is progressing very well in this regard. As a matter of fact, I would say

that a lot of South Australian canned fruit is consumed in this State. It is an industry which we could quite well build up in Western Australia, although it would require a great deal of money. I think, however, that ultimately we would receive adequate interest on the money invested.

THE HON. A. L. LOTON (South) [8.23]: One point I would like to bring to the notice of the Minister is that I have seen a couple of signs along Albany Highway—one on top of the Bedfordale hill, and the other near north of Kojonup. This sign is to the effect that fruit must not be taken south of a certain point. I do not know whether the same notices are placed on other highways but I would like the department to give greater publicity to the fact because we read in every South Australian paper advertisements of the same type. We find that many truckloads of fruit are confiscated, and only last week I read that during the last 12 months in South Australia 150 tons of fruit had been confiscated because people were trying to get through road blocks—for want of a better word. Day by day in this State, large quantities of fruit are being taken from the metropolitan area into the country. People do not realise that they have entered uninfested areas, and when they arrive there and find that the fruit is unusable, they throw it out the window. That is where a lot of the trouble is occurring and I would like the Minister to have more publicity given to the fact that fruit must not be taken further than certain points. I am sure the hon. Mr. Willmott will agree that this should also apply in his area.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (Minister for Industrial Development—North—in reply) [8.24]: Firstly, I would like to thank hon. members for the reception they have given this Bill and for the suggestions that have been made. In regard to the very important matter raised by the hon. Mr. Loton I will have it communicated to the Minister for Agriculture tomorrow because I am myself wholeheartedly in accord with the idea, and I hope that greater publicity and the placing of these notices will have a far-reaching result. With regard to the backyard orchards, I emphasise, that whether they should be treated, controlled, or annihilated, we must give consideration to the rights of the individual.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLANT DISEASES (REGISTRATION FEES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by the Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Minister for Industrial Development), read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (Minister for Industrial Development—North) [8.26] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is complementary to the one just passed and I think I may safely anticipate that whatever may be the fate of many other Bills from now to the closing of the session, this one, too, will pass. A separate enactment arising from Section 39, to which I referred in the complementary Bill, was made in 1939, and was known as the Plant Diseases (Registration Fees) Act, Section 39 (c) remaining unaltered. This Act was repealed in 1941 and the present Act was assented to in December, 1941, being No. 33 of that year.

Subsequent amendments have taken place and the last amendment raised backyard orchard fees from 1s. to 2s. Commercial orchard fees remained unchanged. The present amendments on increases in orchard registration fees must therefore apply to the parent Act, Section 39 (c), and the registration fees Act Section 4, Subsections (1) and (2). This Bill seeks to amend that section which empowers the Minister to charge commercial growers and non-commercial growers a fee for the registering of orchards and gardens.

At present, the section provides that the registration fees for all orchards shall be 2s. per annum—2s. for non-commercial orchards, and 2s. per acre for commercial orchards. In recent years, fruit-fly has caused widespread damage over the entire State and growers have indicated their concern at the inadequate funds available under the provisions of the Act, and their willingness to pay higher registration fees in order to launch a more effective scheme to reduce the incidence of the pest. It has been seen that additional funds are necessary to adopt vigorous counter methods, as research into further fruit-fly baiting schemes and the expansion and operation of present schemes are restricted by insufficient finance.

This Bill, in short, provides for an increase in the registration fees of both commercial orchards of one acre or more and non-commercial orchards of twenty-five trees or more, from 2s. to 5s. per acre. This will not affect the great majority of backyard growers. The purpose of the Bill is to give the Minister power to raise additional finance with which to wage, we hope, a more effective campaign against fruit-fly. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. A. R. JONES (Midland) [8.32]: This is a necessary measure, and I will not oppose the second reading because the Government must have more funds with which adequately to deal with the fruit-fly menace. My only point of disagreement with the measure is that it does not impose a sufficiently large fee in the case of backyard orchards. I would suggest that the provision should be amended so as to perhaps double the figure now stated in the Bill. I am convinced that a fee of 2s. would not cover the cost of an inspector going around and making a proper inspection of backyard orchards. I support the measure.

THE HON. F. D. WILLMOTT (South-West) [8.33]: As the Minister said, this measure is complementary to that which preceded it. As I have already stated, I feel that the backyard orchardist is not now asked to pay sufficient. If we raise the existing fee at all I think it should be raised considerably so that the department could take over the control of fruit-fly. We can't very well ask the backyard orchardist to pay more unless we give him something in return. I suggested, earlier in the session, that the fee should be raised to £1 and that complete control should be taken over by officers of the department. If that were done it would overcome the hon. Dr. Hislop's objection, that many non-commercial growers are frightened of modern sprays, as I believe many of them are. We should raise the fee sufficiently to allow control to be taken over completely by the department, so that the fruit-fly would be wiped out and the backyard orchardist would get the benefit of his fruit. This is not the position today.

I am not inclined to support an amendment which seeks to raise the fee for the backyard orchardist with less than 25 trees, unless it is raised to about £1. If that is not done I feel that, for the time being, the position should be left as it stands.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (Minister for Industrial Development—North) [8.36]: I move—

> That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. A. R JONES (Midland) [8.37]: Perhaps the Minister could find out whether any assessment has been made of the amount that would be required to give the service to backyard orchardists, suggested by the hon. Mr. Willmott. The department, on investigation, would probably be able to recommend that a certain fee would be necessary. I think such an assessment should be made.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by the Hon. H. C. Strickland (Minister for Railways), read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North) [8.38] in moving the second reading said: This measure is designed to alter the contributions and benefits payable under the parent Act. It seeks first to increase members' contributions from £78 per annum to £130 per annum. I wonder how the hon. Mr. Jones will meet that commitment. The second provision is to increase the State subsidy from £6,240 to £10,400 per year, on a £ for £ basis with members.

Next there is provision for a new scale of benefit for hon. members who cease parliamentary service after the 1st January 1959. A comparison of the old and the proposed new rate of benefits is as follows: The new provision is that a membership period of fifteen years and over will provide a pension of £13 10s. per week for twenty years—

The Hon. L. A. Logan: How many hon. members would qualify under that provision?

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: Quite a number, I think. The next provision is that thirteen years' membership will carry a benefit of £13 10s. per week for ten years, reducing to one half the rate for a further ten years, as against the previous rates of £11 and £5 10s. respectively. Another new provision is that after twelve years' service there will be a payment of £12 5s. per week for ten years and then £6 2s. 6d. for ten years. For eleven years' service the payment will be £11 per week for ten years and then £5 10s. per week for ten years. The old rates, in this instance, were £9 10s. and £4 15s. respectively. There is a new provision for a payment of £9 15s. per week for ten years, for ten years' service.

For nine years' service provision is made for a payment of £8 10s. per week for ten years, and in this case the old rate was £7 per week. There is a new provision, for eight years' service, for payment of £7 5s. per week for ten years. For seven years' service the payment will be £6 per week for ten years, as against the old

rate of £4 10s. For less than seven years' service there will be a refund of seven contributions, plus interest at the Commonwealth Savings Bank rate. Widows' benefits are to be paid at two-thirds of the rate to which the husband would have been entitled. Previously the two-thirds rate was payable for the first five years and then one half the rate for the remaining period. A further provision has been included giving the trustees discretionary powers to make a grant to a widow in necessitous circumstances, on application to the trustees by such widow. Details of the circumstances are to be confidential, at the discretion of the trustees. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

THE HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [8.43]: I would say in a kindly fashion to the Minister for Railways, who in a good humoured manner remarked, while speaking to the debate on another Bill, that he wondered whether there would be sufficient time to deal with this measure, that apparently it will be passed quickly. For the information of those hon. members who may not be aware of it, I would point out that the reason why the measure will be passed quickly, is, fundamentally, that it is the result of negotiations by the Rights and Privileges Committee—of which I am a member—over a period of nearly two years.

I wish to compliment the chairman of that committee, which has no statutory standing but is appointed by hon. members to look after their interests. I compliment the hon. Mr. Simpson, as chairman, on the manner in which he has conducted the committee's affairs. He has made this question one of his main interests and he and the committee have gone to a great deal of trouble, over a period of about eighteen months, in negotiating with the Treasurer and ascertaining details of the parliamentary pension funds in the other States of Australia. In particular, the hon. Mr. Simpson has done a great deal of research in this matter. He has communicated with other States in an endeavour to ascertain what is taking place in those parts. I am sure it will be quite a comfort to many hon. members who might run the risk of a political adventure in the very near future to realise that the fund has been improved. The contributions made by hon. members have been increased considerably and the committee does not consider that hon. members are receiving something for nothing. This is a self-contributory scheme which the committee, from time to time, has endeavoured to improve for the benefit of hon. members and, I would suggest, more particularly for the benefit of dependants of hon. members. The Bill, therefore, is the result of those negotiations. There has been no haste with it, because a great deal of time has been spent on considering its provisions.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: The first you heard of it was yesterday.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am sorry the Minister is persisting—

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I am not persisting; it was explained yesterday to hon. members.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I merely wish to point out, in a kindly manner, that this matter received a great deal of consideration before the Bill was introduced and it is not true to say that yesterday was the first time I knew anything about it.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Well, hon. members generally.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The Minister has decided to retract a little bit now. The Premier showed me, and the committee which was asked to study the question, the courtesy of allowing me to have a look at the notes concerning the Bill long before it was presented. The committee had met and considered the deliberations made by the Premier and decided to make a recommendation that hon. members should accept this legislation. I suggest that the Minister should adopt that attitude.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: I am not adopting any attitude.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: This Bill is the result of negotiations that took place over a long period of time and I repeat that the hon. Mr. Simpson has done a great deal of work on behalf of hon. members in connection with it. We should therefore thank him in anticipation of its passing. I support the second reading.

THE HON. C. H. SIMPSON (Midland) [8.49]: There is little I wish to say about the Bill. It is a result of the negotiations that have been proceeding between the trustees of the fund and the Premier over a period. The Premier and the members of the committee of trustees did seek actuarial advice on the matter and I think we are all happy over the general result, particularly those who consider their wives as being their main concern in the payment of superannuation benefits, because the new schedule is more favourable to the widow of any deceased hon. member.

We are thankful for the attitude that hon. members have taken in regard to the Bill, and although we may make some approaches in the future to bring the Act into line with legislation in the other States, in view of the fact that there are still one or two details to be ironed out, I think we can be grateful for what has been done in the meantime. At this stage I wish to thank the Leader of the Opposition for the remarks he has made in regard to what I, as a member of this committee, have done for hon. members. I support the second reading.

THE HON. L. A. LOGAN (Midland) [8.51]: Just in case hon. members, the public and the Press consider that we, as members of Parliament, are bolstering up our superannuation benefits, I think this is the time that they should be disillusioned. As one of the members of the committee, I have accepted these amendments, but I would like to point out to the House and to the public generally that after 13 years' membership we will be entitled to a benefit of £13 10s. a week for 10 years and half of that rate for the following 10 years. Previously we were paying 30s. a week over a period of 13 years for a benefit rate of £11 a week for the first 10 years and £5 10s. a week for the following 10 years, but now for an extra £2 a week for the first 10 years we will be contributing an extra £1 a week. In making a comparison of what we are paying today for the benefits we receive and what we will receive when the Bill becomes law, the contributions are greater in relation to the increased benefits. Therefore, we are not bolstering up our benefits.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Most hon. members will not get it for a long time, either.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: Some hon. members, of course, after they have been in Parliament for 15 years will be entitled to a payment of £13 10s. a week for 20 years.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: You'll be pretty ancient by then.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I will be a pretty crotchety old man by that time. I appreciate that the committee has increased the benefit for a widow to two-thirds of the rate to which the contributor would have been entitled, because I am sure that all hon. members will agree that their widows will be in greater need of these benefits than the contributor when he becomes eligible for payment. As I was saying, at the moment we are paying 30s. for £11 and when this Bill is passed we will be paying £2 10s. a week for a benefit of £13 10s. a week. Therefore, no-one can say, by any stretch of imagination, that, under these amended conditions, hon. members are looking after themselves.

THE HON. J. G. HISLOP (Metropolitan) [8.55]: I would like to congratulate all those who have done the work in regard to this matter, because the new benefits are a great improvement on those that are being granted at the moment. However, I understand that, according to the Act as it stands now, if an hon. member dies and leaves no widow, the amount he has contributed to the fund, plus interest, is paid to his estate. We might consider the possible case that will occur—which does occur with many families—where a female member of the family has cared for the breadwinner over a long period and is totally dependent on him. Therefore, if the wife of a contributor pre-deceases him and his daughter had cared for him over a period of several years and was totally dependent upon him, I think she should become eligible for weekly payments rather than a lump sum of money.

I think we introduced a provision in the Workers' Compensation Act to provide for the female dependant of a worker who had been acting as housekeeper in the place of the wife of the worker to become eligible for weekly benefits in the event of the worker's death. Therefore, if the daughter of an hon. member has given up her life to look after her father she should be entitled to weekly payments should he pre-decease her, rather than be eligible only for a lump sum payment.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North—in reply) [8.57]: I would also like to say a few words in as kindly a manner as that adopted by the Leader of the Opposition. However, the hon. member seemed to be desirous of explaining away the time factor when I remarked that hon. members who had complained about legislation being introduced so late in the session, thus giving them very little time to consider it, would not be complaining in the same way about the introduction of a piece of legislation which would be introduced very late in the session. This is the piece of legislation.

I would like to point out to the hon. Mr. Griffith that this Bill has not been before Parliament as long as any other Bill that has passed through both Houses. The hon. member explained that a committee had done a great deal of work on this matter over a long period. I would point out to him that every Government Bill is considered by Cabinet for a long time before it is presented to Parliament and each measure gets just as much consideration as this Bill did before being presented. The hon. member also suggested to me that these cases happen; and I agree that they do happen; so I take the opportunity of pointing this out to him in order that those who read Hansard will understand.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North) [8.58]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. A. L. LOTON (South) [8.59]: There seems to be some difference of opinion as to when certain hon. members

did certain things on certain dates and perhaps it would be just as well if I put the record right. It was on the 23rd October, 1958, when the trustees met the Premier, who is the Chairman of the Trustees of the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund. It was at that meeting that these recommendations were made and submitted to the Premier before submission to Cabinet.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Over six weeks ago!

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: But the hon. member did not know anything about it at that time, because it was three weeks later when I met the Premier and he told me that Cabinet had been discussing the matter at that stage. Therefore, for the information of hon. members, I would point out that it was on the 23rd October that the trustees met and made certain recommendations.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT (RESUMPTION OF LAND) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Council's amendments.

UNFAIR TRADING AND PROFIT CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Assembly received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Council's amendments.

SWAN RIVER CONSERVATION BILL.

Second Reading.

Debate adjourned from the 27th November.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (Minister for Industrial Development—North—in reply) [9.0]: This is one of the most important Bills introduced into Parliament this session. When I secured the adjournment of the debate the other evening, only three hon. members had spoken to it, and I thought some more opinions might be advanced to give us an opportunity to consider all the views of interested people.

The hon. Mr. Jones raised the first point to which I think I should reply, when he asked what would be the cost to the Government of the operation of this Act for the first couple of years. For the information of the hon. gentleman it is expected that the cost of operation for the first couple of years will be about £5,000 per annum, and that would involve a Government contribution of £3,300 annually. Clause 20 (1) excludes the board from carrying out much of the work which will be done by the Government department, and will be in common with the progressive development of the foreshores, river dredging, improvement and preparation for structural working, training of river banks, and so on.

In the interests of economy, and with the approval of the appropriate Minister, the board will utilise the existing services and personnel of Government departments and local authorities, and every effort will be made to avoid duplication. The hon. Dr. Hislop, in a rather lengthy contribution—by way of an analysis of this Bill—raised many points, some of which I agree with; but there are others to which I am opposed. I would first like to make a general comment on some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman.

He said that this Bill was giving severe powers to an authority which might exercise them prejudicially so far as local governing bodies are concerned; and the hon. gentleman wondered whether sufficient credit had been given to local governing bodies in the work they had already entertained, and in some cases, indeed, achieved. I wish to point out very deliberately, and definitely, that the work of local governing bodies has not only been acknowledged, but it is safe to say that the formation of a body of control has received the support of the Local Government Association; and the local authorities have raised no objection to the Bill.

In connection with the activities of the existing advisory committee, the collaboration with the local authorities has been highly spoken of, and an excellent relationship has obtained. Wherever work has been entered into, and advice taken, which involved particular undertakings, the local governing bodies have received full credit for all they have done, and for the co-operation they have shown.

The main argument advanced by the hon. Dr. Hislop was that there is no necessity for both the board and the committee. As I proceed I hope to clarify in detail the reason for the absolute necessity for both the board and the committee. Notice has been given of many amendments, and the majority of them will affect the acceptance of the principle of the Bill on that point or, alternatively, most of the amendments will be rejected. This measure has been given a tremendous amount of thought by Government officers and authorities. In fact, advantage was taken of an overseas visit by one of our senior engineers who inquired into and reported upon methods obtaining in other countries, including an investigation of what happens in regard to the Thames

River control and development, and in regard to other rivers as heavily utilised for public purposes in America; such as the control of the River Colorado and of the Shasta, two notable rivers of California. They are two of the main waterways which mean life and prosperity to an area which is intensely populated from California to the Mexican boundary. At Davis, the capital of California—which I was privileged to visit 3½ years ago—I was able to obtain the results of intense study by men who had been delegated to study the operations of the lessening of the river flow at different points; control of its banks, the generation of hydro electricity from place to place, and the irrigation of that irrigable land lying between Arizona and the coast at Los Angeles.

More recently, our engineer, Mr. Kenworthy, made a study of the effect of river control in California. So wherever opportunity has offered, many people locally, and our engineers abroad, have considered the effect of legislation of this kind, and the remedies for the various disabilities which uncontrolled rivers can have on a community. Last year, at a very late period of the session, the Legislative Council decided to defeat the Bill by deferring it to August this year. I assume the motion was perfectly bona fide and well intentioned, but that was its effect. There are other ways of killing a Bill—many other ways—and I hope none of them are taken advantage of. For instance, it is possible to kill the Bill by altering what is considered necessary as a pre-requisite to the control of our river by the board; and the receiving by the board of advice from authoritative persons should not be removed from the measure, because that, too, would not only nullify the effect we hope to achieve but could, in fact, entirely destroy its real purpose, which I shall endeavour to outline. Before analysing the effect of one authority in control, I would like to refer to the question of pollution.

The hon. Dr. Hislop gave us a very interesting opinion in this connection. Anyone who has studied the report of the Swan River Reference Committee—the sub-committee report on the pollution of the river—will find that it gives historically the conditions of the river at the time of its first discovery; the first knowledge of it from then, up to the present time. If hon. members have not got a copy of that report, I would advise them to secure one, because it is a wonderful document.

Pollution, however, must not be confused with contamination of a bacteriological kind. That, I think, is one of the most important things in the consideration, by the average person, of what pollution is to our river. Because the river was polluted with rotting algae hundreds of years ago, does not mean it was contaminated. One of the first boats to penetrate into the Swan waters was bogged in rotting algae. The crew had great difficulty in removing it. They were faced with the unpleasantness of odours of many types of algae which grew in the river, but at the same time it was important to observe that none of the odours or the effects of the rotting algae, necessarily meant that they were injurious to health.

Before the river can be regarded as polluted from the point of view of health, it must in some way be contaminated. It is safe to say that many people have the wrong opinion as to the damage that certain effluent causes to the river. It could be that a substance, black in colour, falls into the river from some manufacturing enterprise but when it is absorbed into the total volume of water in the river it is completely unharmful. There are industries—and important industries—in the city, adjacent to the river banks, which have collaborated with the advisory committee, on grounds of health, to preserve this proposed authority's most important asset, the Swan River, in a form decent and fit for use. They have endeavoured to keep this glorious heritage of the people in a state which is non-injurious to health, and in a condition which the public can enjoy and use for its pleasure and for its exercise.

To achieve this objective—to preserve the river in that condition—I submit is an important public function which I referred to at some length when introducing the Bill. It will impinge on the control and disposal of all kinds of effluent, which we must anticipate and which, indeed, must be discharged into the river. Provided we are prepared to exclude sewage and the disposal of any residues which are bacteriologically contaminated, we can expect some progress.

This measure is designed to secure that progress as a long-range plan for development. I want to re-emphasise the point I made when introducing the measure. This plan is for long-range control and development. To give control to the public the Government is anxious that this measure should have a trial run. The Government wishes to give this legislation a new meaning, so that the authorities are set up on a permanent basis in order that other river systems may from time to time be affected. When the Swan River Board, acting on all technical matters on the advice of an advisory committee, continues to exercise its functions in this region, other boards will be created at Bunbury and elsewhere to preserve the beauty of rivers in those parts, and those boards will be subject in their actions to the advice of a strong, powerful and influential advisory committee comprised of people who are able to advise on the many technical subjects involved. So, in the establishment of the board for the Swan River we intend to set up a panel of persons constituting a permanent body, and an advisory committee of like kind.

There will be a continuation of interest of thought on the one part; and a continuation of advice on the other; there will not be a separate and single opinion, but conjoint action.

When advice is needed by the body or the Minister, the more powerful advisory committee will be of very great importance. That is where I differ strongly from the views expressed by the hon. Dr. Hislop when he said that this seemed to be too heavy underneath. That is one of the real purposes in the design of the Bill; that it shall be heavy underneath. The men who are to be selected and who are to advise; the men to whom reference is to be made on particular technical matters; the men who will set the standard for the board to follow; the men who will advise on administrative matters will not be policemen of the river but will be men who will give advice to those who have the work to do.

With respect to the hon. Dr. Hislop, my attitude on the many things in which he serves this State at the moment, whether in connection with organisations dealing with cancer or anything else in which he gives service as an individual, is that he is not in a position, nor does he desire to be in a position, of having to carry out the administrative details of their recommendations. However, he, with others, is always there as a person who is talented and competent to advise.

This board was criticised by the hon. Dr. Hislop as being inferior in its components to the people who are the advisory committee. That is by deliberate intent and design. I will give a parallel which I have drawn up, just to show the sort of people who will constitute the board and who will be their opposite numbers on the advisory committee.

On the board, where an engineer is mentioned, that person will not be Mr. Kenworthy, but will be his immediate junior; the senior engineer under him. Our thoughts are that Mr. Kenworthy will be the member of the committee. In connection with the officer of the Public Health Department, we think that the Commissioner of Public Health should be on the committee and his senior health inspector on the board. In the case of engineering, we think that the Director of Works should be on the committee and his engineer for harbours and rivers on the board, and so on. This is so that the most senior person responsible to the highest public servant of that department may be inter-related in the committee's activity. All should be present at all meetings, if possible not single units called in for advice. The advisory committee should be accessible, so that a problem can be submitted; and after that problem is considered it will be referred to the board. It will be handled almost as a direction from the advisory committee; and both the committee and the board will have access to the Minister.

I hope, therefore, I have made that point clear. I hope that in endeavouring to deal with this national problem—something vital for future generations—something will be achieved in our time to preserve this great heritage of the river, and we will have a continuing authority in the case of Perth. When the plan is extended to other places the advisory committee will be able to give all the assistance necessary.

The board is charged with the responsibility of seeing, by executive action, that the river is preserved, which is important so far as water quality is concerned. Therefore, a certain standard will need to be set up. It will be necessary to have advice in connection with that standard —a standard for impurities—because it is inconceivable that a board actuated by high motives in such a task could plan and take action unless it had an advisory committee contactable to say that something was, in its view, deleterious to the river.

If one looks at the Health Act one will see the severe limitations which are placed on health officers at present. Their powers are negligible. The Act really refers to the pollution of water in swimming areas. Therefore, the Health Department will have absolutely no control at all if present conditions continue. Matter which is very dangerous to health could be pumped into the river away from swimming areas and no action could be taken under the Health Act. I give that as an illustration of the difficulties the Swan River Committee has encountered. Most of its endeavours have been co-operative. It has tried to instil into the minds of the users of the river and into the minds of manufacturers near the river, the necessity of being careful. I can say without exception that the co-operation of industry has been splendid. It is felt by those to whom I have spoken in authoritative places, and who conceivably may be on the advisory committee and on the other level constituting the board, that very rarely has there been any attempt by industry to avoid responsibility.

The Swan River has a rise and fall of two feet or thereabouts, and the greatest care must be exercised in that connection. There is no rise and fall which will clear the estuaries; there is no ebb or flow, and there is no rise and fall of tide available which will remove the dangerous substances quickly. But the greatest asset is the expanse of the river—the quantity of the water in it. All matter is quickly dispersed.

Mention was made by the hon. Dr. Hislop to both the board and the committee having authority under the Bill to employ

inspectors. In the first place, it is likely that the board will have a permanent inspector; but if it is thought necessary in order to deal with certain matters, the advisory committee will also appoint an inspector. It will be readily seen that it is designed so that in the event of any dispute expert authority will be called. The men I have referred to are highly skilled in their individual professions, and they would not necessarily rely on their own opinions. They would call in an inspector —a person selected for that job at the time—to report on something which may be in dispute, and which may even have been reported to the Minister. That is the purpose of the inspector under the control of the advisory committee.

It has been suggested that in the appointment of one entity, the river control could be adequately handled. However, I do suggest that we should approve this foundation law for the preservation of the river. It is not a law of the Medes and Persians; it is something that can be amended as required; it can be altered to suit circumstances, and changed from decade to decade.

It is a Bill which will give rights to certain people, the majority of whom will be representative of local authorities. There is not the predominance of Government servants in this instance as was the case in the original Bill. Very careful thought has been given to this matter, and while there seems to be a large number of people involved, all of them have some association or some alliance with river activities. No-one will, I am sure, deny that people of responsibility are apt to do the right thing and not the irresponsible thing. That is the approach we must have in considering this Bill in detail.

No-one, at the moment, has any authority for river control. The committee has no control; and it is a remarkable thing that there has been a co-operative effort between local authority and Government; local authority and industry; and industry and Government. Surely that is the reason for the progress we have made in the last 20 years, particularly when we consider that in 1932 when the dredges commenced to pump shell and residues into the river which created that beautiful area from the Esplanade around Riverside Drive to the Causeway, there were many critics of that proposal. When I first came to Western Australia the reeds and the tidal influences were up to the base of the back fence of Christian Brothers' College, and into the Government House grounds. Subsequently—I think, in the year 1934, when Mounts Bayrd. was widened and the unsightly scars were then on the hills—again there was a lot of criticism. All that was done then was designed to meet the circumstances of development in anticipation of the years to come.

Much of what was done was created and put into effect by Government engineers acting in consultation with the Ministers of whichever Government was in power. I suggest that on both sides of the river great work has been done. Considerable acreages which today are worth hundreds of thousands of pounds have been taken out of the river, and the river in consequence—the river itself and its banks—is more beautiful than it was before.

To conclude on the questions of the board versus the advisory committee, and the necessity to have both, I say it is necessary to clothe the board with authority, subject to advice from the highest experts in their sphere, in the State—the advisory committee—and finally to have a right of appeal to the Minister.

I draw the attention of the hon. Dr. Hislop to Clause 45 which he said he had not noticed. This provision ensures an appeal based on a similar principal to that in the Town Planning Act.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: It has been noticed all right.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The hon. Dr. Hislop, during the course of his speech—and that is what I am referring to—said there was no appeal. He wanted to see that it was pegged somewhere; that there could be an appeal. It can be said that in the framing of Clause 45, there is no desire to deal flippantly with the matter, because in responsible Governments it is not our experience—nor is it history—that the majority of Ministers are irresponsible. Most of them are very responsible people. In my knowledge, there has never been an experience of irresponsibility on the part of a Minister; and when a Minister has been an arbitrator or a person to decide between one influence and another he has not regarded his responsibility other than very seriously.

So it is in this matter. A provision has been introduced into the clause to ensure that there is a right of appeal which stops, as the hon. member desires, at a point with the result that neither side can indulge in expensive litigation.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Don't you think a man should have the right to go to a court when he disagrees with a Minister?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think that in certain circumstances some of our laws, which are framed to give the right of appeal to a Minister, have worked satisfactorily; and I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that if he can pinpoint where such an appeal is permissible and, injustice has been done, the people, and indeed Parliament, would desire an amendment to the law to allow full access to the Privy Council.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: Would it not be a bit late when it is not subject to appeal in the Bill?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: No. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that in the preparation of the Bill there has been a keen desire to have co-operative effort everywhere; to have simplicity of action at every stage; and to give to the people involved in costly industrial enterprises, satisfaction. There again, the advisory committee is the authority on whom the Minister will lean when requesting a report on something complained of, and in respect of which the board takes the stand that the Minister is not satisfied.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will leave it, and we can have some more debate on it in Committee.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It is open to debate. Whilst it is arguable that we can set down in the Bill that a specific court or authority shall determine litigation, I think at this stage we should endeavour to avoid doing so. I have little more to say in reply to the many points raised by the different speakers. I do not agree, however, with the hon. Mr. MacKinnon when he said that this is to be just another Government authority. This is what he said, "We are faced with another form of Government. Surely there are other alternatives to creating this board. I am not at all confident that it is absolutely necessary. Is this necessary at all?"

I sharply disagree with those ideas. I think they are not modern thinking in connection with a modern problem. I think, too, that we must all guard against easy criticism of instrumentalities and entities which are developed by Government action. After all, in the main the Government acts with full respect for public feeling. If it does not, it does not last long as a Government. In this instance, what can be done except for the Government to give an outline of what appears to be the proper need and to give effect to that proper need by a satute of this kind?

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

The Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Minister for Industrial Development) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—put and passed.

Clause 3—Arrangement:

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: If we debate the first amendment, we debate the central core of most of the other amendments I have on the notice paper. It is obvious that from the inception the Minister and I have had a completely different idea of what is required for the administration of this measure. I can see where our thoughts do not coincide. I would call the advisory committee, the board; and I would call the board the advisory committee. I think the major mass of power is in the advisory board. It is obvious that the Bill has been designed so that the advisory committee shall stand behind not only this first board but all boards that might be formed for rivers within the State. Our views are so fundamentally different on the question of administration that it is simply a matter of putting the question to the Committee.

I have no desire to make it impossible for the measure not to function, because I wish to see it become law, but there are great difficulties to be faced. The board will have power to enter into contracts; but this, surely, should be the prerogative of the heads of departments. Yet, the second in charge of the department will be a member of the board which arranges the contracts.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: He will be no nondescript person.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I quite agree, but he does not represent the actual authority of the department. The advisory committee, which is to be the power behind the throne, very often will have to wait for a request from the board before it can act. At the request of the board it has authority to do certain things. It can lay down standards only when the board asks it to; but it can undertake research without the consent of the board. I can see considerable confusion in this administration.

I am certain that if we could spend weeks together we could hammer out something so that both our ideas would function extremely well. I leave the Committee to decide whether dual administration can succeed, or whether we should have single administration. I move an amendment—

> Page 2—Delete the reference to Part IV in lines 11 to 16.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I again draw attention to the very important fact that if we are to place the busiest men in their spheres in the city on the board, there will be very little done from day to day because they will not have the time.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: How often does the board meet?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It could meet perhaps weekly or fortnightly and, once it gets moving, there will be an accumulation of people representing local authorities along the river banks raising points for decision. When a matter which requires technical advice is brought up they will request that advice. I hope the Committee defeats the amendment.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: Some of the busiest men in the medical profession will be represented on the council set up under the Cancer Council Bill, but the work will be delegated to institutes; we presume there will be institutes just as there will

be river boards in this case. In this instance a thinking group of people will have to wait to do things; and it seems to me that there could be a considerable amount of confusion. I cannot understand the method of administration in this case.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am a little confused as to why we must have a board and an advisory committee. A little further on in the Bill we find these words, "When constituted the Board is an agency of the Crown in right of the State". So there does not seem to be any doubt about the position of the board. It will have the advisory committee to give it further advice, and that committee will be able to do many things in its own right. The board is an agency of the Crown. I cannot see why there should be so many controls in a matter like this.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You would if you studied the Bill a little more.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: While there appears to be some confusion as regards the advisory committee and the board, I think the Minister has made it perfectly clear that the services of the advisory committee will be required from time to time. I agree with him. However, I think he was inclined to overstate the number of occasions on which the committee would be expected to meet. On page 10 the remuneration is laid down.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: That clearly shows the situation.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: It sets out that meetings are to be monthly.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It may be necessary to meet fortnightly.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: That means to say that for one meeting a month they will not be paid. As regards the amendment, I agree with the Minister.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—10	
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. C. R. Abbey
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	*(Teller.)*
Hon. R. C. Mattiske	

Noes—17	
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. R. F. Hutchison	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. A. R. Jones	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	Hon. G. Bennetts
Hon. A. L. Loton	*(Teller.)*

Majority against—7.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: The Committee will be delighted to know that at this stage of the proceedings I shall not be pursuing a great mass of the amendments on the notice paper.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—Interpretation:

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

> Page 3, line 18—Add after the word "Board" the following words:—
>
> > or a permit which prior to the coming into force of this Act has been granted by the relevant Government department or local authority.

Those who already have permits feel that they should be entitled to retain them, and that the board should be bound to renew permits which have already been issued by relevant Government departments, most of which will be represented on the board. I do not think it would be unfair to ask that those who now hold permits be allowed to continue to work under them.

Sitting suspended from 10 p.m. to 10.35 p.m.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The Committee would be unwise to agree to this amendment, the prime reason being that an examination made by the existing committee and the appropriate department has failed to locate any current permits given by authorities. A permissive right to do certain things in regard to effluent has built up. There has been considerable co-operation with the desires of the committee to ensure that the river will not be despoiled by effluents that could contaminate it; especially bacterially.

If the clause is to stand without this amendment, as soon as the proposed board is constituted permits will be issued to many concerns, such as the superphosphate works and Swan Brewery, whose co-operation up till now has been very satisfactory When the time comes for the issue of a permit, then we should consider the amendment before us.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: In view of the assurance of the Minister that no permit has been issued I ask leave to withdraw my amendment. It is curious that some people should ask members of Parliament to ensure that their existing permits be respected, when in fact the Minister tells us that no such permit has been issued.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Hon. A. L. LOTON: I wish to ask one question. Certain land holders have water rights in the Canning River. Have those rights in water anything to do with the issue of the permit?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Under the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act certain permissive rights are given to people to draw water from the upper reaches of the river, but all of them are above the specified line of the area to be proclaimed as being within the authority of the board.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

Page 4, line 6—Insert after the word "both" the words "without permit".

One cannot continue to pollute the river if one is discharging effluent into the river with the permission of the board. However, I am moving the amendment in order to make the position clear, so that people discharging effluent with a permit will not be deemed to be polluting the river.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think this is not an unreasonable amendment, because with the definition standing as it is, it cannot affect a permit after it is issued. I am quite prepared to accept the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would like the Minister to give me an explanation. The definition of "waters" on page 4 of the Bill, is that "waters" will mean the area which will be from time to time proclaimed. In the next paragraph, waters are nominated. I am inquisitive now since the hon. Mr. Loton's question regarding the rights of water and the Minister's comment that the rights of water were—

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Under a different Act altogether.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes. But the Minister also said that they were above the line as defined in this Bill. I would respectfully query that, because on page 5 of the Bill mention is made of the junction of the Swan and Canning Rivers. I know of pumping rights that are between the Kent-st. Weir at Cannington and the junction of the Southern River and the Canning River, and that puts a doubt in my mind.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: A short explanation of the two points raised by the hon. Mr. Griffith that this clause gives power to vary, by proclamation, the controlled area as set out on page 5 of the Bill, so that any new industry beyond the statutory limits as at present existing may be controlled. The board and the engineers and those who are likely to have some association with this legislation are not at all worried about the cultivable areas adjoining any of our rivers, because there is a clear consciousness of local erosion; of the conserving of valuable soil; of the discharging by drainage of certain fertiliser agents into the river which, by the way, provoke a terrific growth of algae.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Has that been definitely proved yet?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Yes. And therefore what we are trying to do is to ensure that, if we find damage is occurring, an alternative area will be prescribed before Parliament meets and presented to Parliament on its meeting.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I thank the Minister for his explanation but if we accepted it, it would leave a lot of unnecessary verbiage in the Bill, because all we need to do is to say that water means that area which from time to time is proclaimed under the regulations, and leave it at that.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I think the power to define where waters are controlled is a very necessary one.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I agree with the Minister, but why not stick to some basis of defining this word. Therefore, I move an amendment—

Page 4—Delete all words from and including the word "and" in line 35 down to and including the word "River" in line 39.

Anyone who has an intimate knowledge of the junction of the Southern and Canning Rivers will know that along the Canning River the ground is very fertile. There are pumping rights there and some people have had them for many years. If this Bill were passed, the meaning of the word "waters" would apply beyond the existing pumping rights. If it could be cut off at the Kent-st. Weir it would not damage anyone's pumping rights. I suggest it is very important, because of the particular formation of the river in those places, to leave it in its natural state and not allow anyone to come and de-snag it and clear it to ensure a quicker flow. The river dries up in the summertime and, with the advent of the new weir, 2,000,000 gallons have to be released in order to let these people who have pumping rights receive the water. After all, this is only experimental legislation and it could be amended any time it was found necessary. In paragraph (b) I would like to strike out the words "junction of the Southern and Canning Rivers" and substitute the words "Kent-st. Weir on the Canning River."

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I want to be absolutely reasonable in my approach to the definitions, because the vital principle in the Bill has been retained. If, after it has been in operation, it requires amendment, it should be amended by Parliament when it next meets. The difference between the Bill and what the hon. member desires is to stop the control at the Kent-st. Weir. The rest remains as it is.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: With the exception that you will not be able to define from time to time.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Then I must object to the amendment, because in Subclause (2) there is power to define from time to time.

The Hon. A. F. Griffith: I will come to that in due course.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: But I am not going to be caught off guard. It is very necessary that we be able to specify an area which may be varied by circumstances quickly developing.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: How?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: An establishment may discharge into one part of the river something absolutely prejudicial to the rest of the river. Surely we are not going to deny the control of an activity of that kind. The Rights in Water and Irrigation Act will not in any way conflict with the preservation of the Swan River and its tributaries. In using river water, people would not deliberately contribute to erosion and so on, as they would be losing their wealth.

The Hon. A. L. Loton: It is their asset.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: Exactly, and it is their desire and intention to preserve it. I could not agree to the amendment in those circumstances.

The Hon. L. C. DIVER: I can understand the anxiety of the hon. Mr. Griffith that there should be no disturbance of these watering places along the rivers. The Minister has answered that by saying that it was hardly likely that anyone would contemplate disturbing such a state of affairs. If the Minister would give an assurance that such would be the case, I would accept it. But I agree with the Minister that it is highly desirable to leave the words in the Bill. The charcoal iron industry at Wundowie is at present pouring poisonous substances into the creeks; they are killing vegetation and the water is highly dangerous to stock. I do not know whether the same thing occurs with the tannin extract factory at Toodyay; but it is to prevent such things happening that the Bill has been introduced, and we should leave the words in question in the measure so that the necessary authority will be included.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It was not my intention that the Minister should be caught unawares.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It would be my fault if I were caught unawares.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Knowing the hon. member as well as I do, I could not imagine him getting caught like that. The area I have mentioned is all agricultural land. I know of one family that has had a property there for 70 years. It has been handed down from father to son.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: Are the pumping stations increasing in number?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: No. It is extremely difficult to get pumping rights in that area. I might mention that some effluent is entering the river somewhere in the vicinity of the Kelmscott pool. Also, soil from certain parts of the river is being taken away and sold.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I know of both those things.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: The people in the area covet the possession they have.

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: Then you should strongly support the clause.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I strongly support protection for these people. I cannot see why the words should not be removed, although I agree with the Minister that the present Minister for Works would say the same as the Minister for Industrial Development has said about their protection. We are allowing this authority to go too far. I want to come down a couple of miles to the Kent-st. Weir to give these people a little more protection, and my amendment would do that.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I will agree to the deletion of the words sought by the hon. member on both pages 4 and 5 of the Bill. I will also agree to the insertion of the words "Kent-st. Weir", but I cannot agree to take out the power to define. The reasons are obvious and, rather than reiterate them, I would prefer to test the matter.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I appreciate the Minister agreeing to the insertion of the words "Kent-st. Weir" but has not the Minister got other powers in Subclause (2)?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: This would not be done frivolously. The power to define these areas would not mean an extension of the areas we are taking out now.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH. I accept the Minister's explanation, and feel that half a loaf is better than no bread at all.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I would draw the attention of the Minister to the words "high water mark" in lines 40 and 41 of page 4. Can this positively be determined? I understand the words "high water mark" are indefinable.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: They are definable, and are acted upon as a true definition of boundaries in title deeds. They are measured in the case of pearling leases where the dredging for pearls occurs in Shark Bay. They are defined in agreements between the Crown as owner and tenants of the Crown. The high water mark in general terms is taken as something less than the spring tide range; not the neap tide or spring tide, but something less than the spring tide range.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I still have in mind the legal battles in connection with old titles in which the owner had

rights down to the water level at high water mark, but I accept the Minister's explanation.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move an amendment—

> Page 5, line 7—Delete the words "junction of the Southern and" and insert in lieu the words "Kent-st. Weir on the".

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 8—put and passed.

Clause 9—Interests represented on the Board:

The Hon. G. E. JEFFERY: Of the four persons to be nominated by the Local Government Association I would ask that at least one be a member of one of the local governing bodies on the eastern extremity of the river.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I shall recommend that to the Minister controlling the department and I am sure it will be agreed to.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 10 and 11—put and passed.

Clause 12—Quorum:

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: When this Bill was printed and presented, there were 15 members, and eight formed a quorum. Now that we have additional members on the board we might reasonably make nine a quorum. I move an amendment—

> Page 12, line 8—Delete the word "eight" and insert in lieu the word "nine".

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 13 to 21—put and passed.

Clause 22—Authority and duty included in functions of the Board:

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

> Page 16—Delete all words from and including the word "to" in line 8 down to and including the word "Board" in line 10 and substitute the following:—
>
> > advise in the formation and promulgation of schemes.

I have moved this amendment because of the various interpretations of the word "promulgate" one finds in dictionaries. The board should not have the power of authorising or proclaiming any schemes which do not involve it in any expenditure. There should be some agreement between the local authority and the board, particularly if a large sum of money is involved.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I think it would be undesirable to take away from the board all the functions excepting those which would revert to its being in an advisory capacity. The board has to formulate schemes; but this does not mean that it will put them into effect. I would be prepared to accept a suitable word in place of "promulgate" so long as it did not decrease the board's authority and development. It is necessary for the board to have authority and ability to do some sort of promulgation from time to time. It could be in relation to aligning a river bank or in the preparation of works for the banking of the river.

The Hon. J. G. Hislop: Could the board have power to implement?

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: That is desired, and that word might meet the situation. If the hon. member would care to withdraw his amendment and include the word "implement", I would be prepared to accept it.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: In view of the Minister's explanation, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

> Page 16, line 8—Delete the word "promulgate" and substitute the word "implement".

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. G. HISLOP: I move an amendment—

> Page 16—Add the following proviso to paragraph (a):—
>
> > Provided no resumption or filling in of an area greater than ten acres of the Swan River shall be undertaken until the consent of both Houses of Parliament has been given.

I originally intended the amendment to relate to "five" acres, but have changed it to "ten" acres. The reason is that it may interfere with resumption work and works that are already in progress if the smaller area were used.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: It would have been undesirable to accept an amendment to include "five" acres. It would have interfered with work at the Fremantle harbour. At the moment I think there would be no interference with contemplated work, so I accept the amendment.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 23 to 44—put and passed.

Clause 45—Appeals against refusal of Board to grant permit or give approval:

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In referring to this clause a short while ago the Minister said he did not see any reason why the Committee should go beyond the point of giving the right of appeal to the Minister. Even in the Act which I consider to be the most obnoxious on our statute book—I do not know its name now but it was the Unfair Trading and Profit Control Act—there is a right of appeal. As a matter of fact, I think the appeal can be taken to the High Court of Australia. It is now going to be left to the Minister and there is going to be no appeal; so what the Minister says goes. I think it is likely that if the board wanted to do something, the Minister would be prone to follow the advice of the board, and there the matter would stand.

It is a principle of British justice that a man shall have the right of appeal and that the final decision shall not start and finish with a Minister of the Crown.

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: The provision which governs the matter provides that the only appeal against the decision of the board is vested in the Minister. This is not in regard to a criminal offence or even a civil offence, but something resembling a very minor matter in local government, where the Minister is vested with power to determine, with no appeal, matters presented to him. There is the same power under the Town Planning Act, which involves rights in property worth tens of thousands of pounds. The Minister's decision is final there. The position would be different if it could be illustrated that that responsibility had been violated. The responsibility is one in which no litigation is likely except where people are fond of litigation. It is a simple and direct way of deciding something which bears no comparison with any criminal action.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I ask the Minister to recall the conversation I had with him regarding a matter where I was asked to negotiate an agreement between a local authority and a sporting organisation. The Minister adjudicating on the question took the view that, where an arrangement was being made between the local authority and a sporting body and the local authority was going to pay that body some money out of the ratepayers' funds, everybody in the area should participate in the sport. He stuck to that opinion, as he had the right to, but it is dreadful to think that there could be no appeal from such a decision. I appreciate that litigation-hungry people could cause trouble, but we cannot take risks with the rights of the individual. There must be an appeal to a higher authority—

The Hon. A. R. Jones: What about arbitration?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: A judge of the Supreme Court could be the arbitrator. I will now ask the Committee to decide the matter. I move an amendment—

> Page 30, line 23—Delete all words in the clause after the word "Board."

The Hon. F. J. S. WISE: I have instanced the fact that the final decision of a Minister has been accepted under many laws. I know no Minister of the Crown in Australia who acts capriciously in such matters. If the hon. member could buttress his case by illustrating where similar powers prejudice the rights of the individual it would be different, but he has given only a hypothesis of something which may never happen. In the last week or two I have had the great privilege of serving this State as a member of the Government, with authority to determine appeals, and what happens? The circumstances of every case are weighed without prejudice. I appeal to the Committee to accept the clause as printed.

The Hon. H. K. WATSON: Under the Municipal Corporations Act and to a lesser extent under the Town Planning Act there is a right of appeal to the Minister from the decision of a local authority, and his decision is final. It is equally true that in many matters under the Town Planning Act there is provision for the settlement of disputes by arbitration. I will give an illustration of how the existing provisions of the Municipal Corporations Act, where the Minister's decision is final, can operate unjustly because there is no appeal. Take the proposition, human nature being what it is, that a judge, a Minister or anyone else is giving a decision in the knowledge that there is no right of appeal. That decision is not necessarily given with the same impartiality as if there were a right of appeal.

I recall a case where a municipality frivolously refused an industry power to extend its buildings and left the aggrieved ratepayer to appeal to the Minister. That council was informed by the Secretary for Local Government that the Minister could do nothing but uphold the appeal. Imagine the the surprise of that local governing body and the aggrieved ratepayer when the Minister refused the appeal! Had there been a right of appeal, the Minister's decision would have been upset. In that instance the Minister concerned should have granted the appeal but he said "No," on the urging of a member of the Town Planning Association who had a personal interest in the question. That is why there should be some appeal.

I can appreciate what the Minister for Industrial Development has said in connection with the responsibility of Ministers and about their acting fairly and squarely generally. However, in the nature of

things there is an inclination for many of them simply to support their departmental officers. I will admit that if the Minister in charge of the Bill were the Minister who, for all time, was to handle this legislation, I would be satisfied with his decisions, but unfortunately the Minister in charge of the Act at the moment will not always be there.

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Sometimes they uphold the decision of the local authority.

The Hon. R. C. MATTISKE: I support the amendment because even though the Minister says the average run of all matter which is the subject of appeal may be only minor, there could easily be major matters on which an appeal may be necessary. In such a case it is placing too much power in the hands of the Minister to give a decision over a body which is comprised so largely of civil servants. Even if the individual may avail himself of the right of appeal to an authority higher than the Minister on very rare occasions, that provision should be included in the Bill. From the point of view of ensuring British justice that provision is necessary. The individual should feel that if his case warrants it, he should be able to go to the Supreme Court. I strongly urge the Committee to support the amendment.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes—16

Hon. C. R. Abbey	Hon. R. C. Mattiske
Hon. J. Cunningham	Hon. J. Murray
Hon. L. C. Diver	Hon. H. L. Roche
Hon. A. F. Griffith	Hon. C. H. Simpson
Hon. J. G. Hislop	Hon. J. M. Thomson
Hon. L. A. Logan	Hon. H. K. Watson
Hon. A. L. Loton	Hon. F. D. Willmott
Hon. G. C. MacKinnon	Hon. A. R. Jones *(Teller.)*

Noes—11

Hon. G. Bennetts	Hon. H. C. Strickland
Hon. E. M. Davies	Hon. J. D. Teahan
Hon. J. J. Garrigan	Hon. W. F. Willesee
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. F. J. S. Wise
Hon. G. E. Jeffery	Hon. R. F. Hutchison
Hon. F. R. H. Lavery	*(Teller.)*

Majority for—5.

Amendment thus passed.

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I move an amendment—

> Page 30—Add a subclause to stand as subclause (2) as follows:—
>
> "(2) Such person may appeal from a decision of the Minister to a judge of the Supreme Court."

Now that the words have been struck out, I move this amendment to insert new Subclause (2).

The Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You took out all the words after the word "board", did you?

The Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Yes.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 46—put and passed.

Title—put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

NATIVES (CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE HON. J. M. THOMSON (South) [11.58]: My remarks on the second reading of this Bill will be extremely brief. This measure has much to commend it because it constitutes an approach to the native problem by dealing with those natives under the age of 21 years. I am of the opinion that the Bill can be improved with two or three amendments, and as no doubt the Bill will pass the second reading stage, I will reserve what I have to say until the time the Bill goes into Committee.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North—in reply) [12.0]: I was most interested in the speeches which have been made during the second reading. Some criticism was levelled at the attitude of the department towards a native woman who became a mother. I would like to give the exact circumstances. The hon. Mr. Logan stated that it was quite competent for the Department of Native Welfare to pay the medical expenses of that woman. It is still quite competent for the department to do so, but the point is that the department did not know the condition of the woman until the time of confinement. As the paternity of the child has not yet been determined, the Department of Native Welfare cannot take any action.

The hon. member also said it would be possible to issue that woman with a certificate of exemption. That would have been possible had any prior advice been given to the department. The department did not sit down on the job.

The Hon. L. A. Logan: It could have done that afterwards.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It is not able to do so now. That is what the Commonwealth Government insists on. It insists that before the mother can become entitled to any social service benefits, either a certificate of exemption or citizenship rights shall have been granted. The Commonwealth Government placed

the onus on the Department of Native Welfare to determine whether or not the woman was a native. It is the Commonwealth Social Services Department and our existing laws which determine the degree of native blood. That is the deciding factor as to whether or not a person is regarded as a native. The Commonwealth law as well as the State law insists on that being done. In this State the law stipulates that less than quadroon or three-quarter white blood is classed as a native, and the same applies under the Commonwealth legislation. That is why the department gets into a tangle in having to trace the ancestry of cases such as this, even to the degree of ascertaining the blood to one thirty-secondth part. There have been cases in the past where the degree has been determined to one sixty-fourth part. It is terrible to have to do that in order to obtain what has been referred to by some hon. members as British justice.

The hon. Mr. Logan mentioned that it would have been competent for the department to have assisted. We agree. Had the department been advised it would have assisted. It will assist now and in future, where it can and where the law permits of it doing so. If the department were to issue a certificate of exemption now, the Commonwealth Social Services Department would say we were doing that to overcome the difficulty, and it would fight us all the way. That is its attitude towards Australian-born Australians. That is a terrible state under which these people have to live. Can anyone wonder why they have very little confidence in themselves and in their future when they are treated in that manner?

I am pleased with the reception of this Bill. It is a start. It is a totally different type of legislation, compared with the Bill introduced earlier. The Bill before us will only affect those who prove to the board that they are entitled to be classed as citizens.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: It is a pity you have not done something for the young children when they leave the missions.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It is a pity we have not been able to do lots of things. The hon. member has been in Parliament for a great number of years and no one has held him back if he wanted to introduce an amending Bill. There would have been no harm in his trying. As a private member, I myself made several attempts to try to improve the conditions of these people. That is why we have been elected to Parliament.

The hon. Mr. Thomson has given notice of amendments. Those are designed to bring about an improvement in the situation of these people. With a few minor adjustments these amendments will enable all children of natives, who possess citizenship rights, to be granted citizenship rights if they are under 21 years of age. The children now over 21 years of age of any natives possessing citizenship rights will not be granted citizenship rights automatically if this amended Bill becomes law. They will have to apply for citizenship through the normal channels; that is by applying to the board.

On behalf of the Government I accept the amendments of the hon. Mr. Thomson, providing he agrees to a few minor adjustments. If that is done, the objective intended will be achieved. All fears expressed by hon. members regarding the offspring of citizenship right holders will be allayed.

I would like to emphasise clearly that in spite of the provision in the parent Act, whereby every offspring of a native possessing citizenship rights must apply at the age of 21, if this Bill is passed such offspring will not be required to apply for citizenship rights on attaining the age of 21. The grant of citizenship rights will become irrevocable. In the case of the children now over 21 years of age, citizenship rights will not be conferred automatically, and they will have to go through the usual channel by applying to the board. The Bill with those amendments should meet with the approval of hon. members.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

The Hon. W. R. Hall in the Chair; the Hon. H. C. Strickland (Minister for Railways) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—put and passed.

Clause 3—Section 4 amended:

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

> Page 2, line 3—Insert after the word "amended" the paragraph designation "(a)".

That is self-explanatory.

Amendment put and passed.

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

> Page 2—Add at the end of the clause a new paragraph as follows:—
>
> (b) by adding a new paragraph (c) to subsection (2) as follows:—
>
> (c) stating the full names, sex and date of birth of all children under the age of twenty-one years..

This amendment seeks to include these particulars in the statutory declaration, as required by Section 4 of the principal

Act. Under the Bill the children under 21 years of age of citizenship rights holders will be granted citizenship rights automatically and irrevocably. On attaining citizenship rights it is essential to keep a register recording the particulars of the children of applicants.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4—Section 5 amended:

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I move an amendment—

Page 2—Delete paragraph (c) and substitute a new paragraph (c) as follows:—

(c) by deleting in subsection (5) the words "may upon application in the prescribed form" and substituting the word "shall."

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5—Section 6 amended:

The Hon. J. M. THOMSON: I move an amendment—

Page 2—Delete paragraph (c).

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—Section 7 repealed:

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: This is the clause dealing with revocation about which I spoke on the second reading. I do not know whether the Minister has given any thought to it but I suggest that the native himself who had obtained citizenship rights should have the right to apply for either their suspension or revocation.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: The hon. member spoke to me about this and I passed his message on to the Minister in charge of the department. He said he was not convinced that it was necessary at this stage. He is of the opinion that we should accept the Bill as it is printed now, because there would be very few affected. To make it quite clear, the hon. Mr. Logan had in mind that there may be some of the natives who would want to get back under the Native Welfare Act but only upon their own application could they do so. The Minister's idea is that this Bill should be passed and then if it is found necessary to bring down some amendments, this could be done next session.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I feel that we should give the measure a trial. One point that the Minister has not mentioned is that if when a native applies for citizenship rights he knows they cannot be revoked, even on his own application, he will think very carefully before making an application. He will take it more seriously, and therefore I feel inclined to give the Bill a trial, and if it is not satisfactory we can amend it later.

The Hon. L. A. LOGAN: I want to point out that no longer have we the two-year qualifying period in the Act. Up till now a native has had to prove he has not lived the life of a native for two years before he makes application.

In addition to that, there is the aspect of those native children who might be 20 or so, and as soon as this Bill is proclaimed they will automatically receive citizenship rights. They will not have to prove they can live as a white person. It is quite conceivable that some do not want to live as we do. Freedom of the individual has been mentioned and if people do not want to come under our way of life, I think they should have the right to say so. It is that class of person I am thinking of. I am not going to pursue the subject. I just wanted to point out why I had broached it.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: I can see what the hon. Mr. Logan is driving at but I think we should give this Bill a trial and see how it will work out. We might as well say that the white person who is a citizen should be able to apply to have his rights taken away so that he can live with the natives.

The Hon. J. M. Thomson: You are forcing this on them.

The Hon. F. D. WILLMOTT: According to a great deal we have been told, we are not forcing it on them, they are grabbing it from us.

The Hon. G. BENNETTS: Regarding the argument that just cropped up concerning the native who turns 21 and who is automatically given citizenship rights, I wonder whether he will want the rights. I was on the Merredin station after the elections waiting for the train which was not due for another hour and a half. A well educated native approached me and, after we had talked for a while, I asked him whether he had citizenship rights. He told me he did not have them and that he would not apply for them. The reason he gave was that if he did, he and his family would be removed from the reserve and he would have nowhere to live. For this reason, I believe that these natives should be given the right to apply if they want to.

The Hon. J. M. A. CUNNINGHAM: I am very much in sympathy with the thoughts expressed by the hon. Mr. Logan. We have to be very careful, because at the moment children of parents who have citizenship rights are not entitled to enter hotels. If automatic citizenship rights were granted to them they would be entitled to enter hotels. This could be the means of bringing them under moral suasion and pressure from other natives

to obtain liquor for them. In this way we are making it hard for them not to break the law. Older people have that extra persuasion with the young folk and I am most concerned about it. Give the Bill a try by all means, but in the meantime there could be a lot of young natives put in the position where they will break the law, pay the penalty, and have a bad record right from the beginning of their citizenship amongst whites. I believe this would be very detrimental to their future life.

It would give ammunition to those who are against them, if they could point to so many cases of drunkenness after a 12 months' trial. I am happy to give it a try if generous consideration is given to those cases which do arise.

The Hon. R. F. HUTCHISON: I am amazed at the way some hon. members shift their ground. I agree with the hon. Mr. Willmott that this provision will give the natives a standing which they will value. I believe everyone born in this country should be a citizen by right of birth. Why are some hon. members afraid of what might happen? Let us grant the natives citizenship rights, and see what happens.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7 and 8, Title—put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Assembly with amendments.

STATE FORESTS.

To Revoke Dedication.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the motion by the Hon. H. C. Strickland (Minister for Railways) to concur in the Assembly's resolution.

THE HON. J. MURRAY (South-West) [12.35 a.m.]: This question bears considerably on land settlement. I commend this year's report by the Conservator of Forests to hon. members to study in its entirety. He has this year brought out a report which is much more readily understandable than has previously been the case; and if hon. members study the figures contained in it, it will be seen that they show a large-scale reduction in sawmill output over the period under review, owing to the present slight recession in the industry and a reduction in manpower.

I am pleased to find, from the figures given in the report, that the output per man per year—on last year's operations—is equal to the highest on record, which was in 1955-56. Another interesting point in the report is the eventual extent of State forests envisaged by the conservator, who states that, out of the entire area of Western Australia, he will have to be satisfied with approximately 5,000,000 acres in the heavy rainfall districts of the State. That is not a large acreage, but I believe it is the maximum area that can be used for cutting in perpetuity.

The conservator is compelled by statute to place before both Houses of Parliament the partial revocation of certain small areas of our State forests. My experience of various Conservators of Forests, and Ministers for Forests, has been that they are most zealous in maintaining State forests. One Minister said only recently that all our forests were portion of the Queen's estate.

It is ridiculous to think that the Conservator of Forests would allow to be excised from our State forests any portion that contained timber which would in perpetuity be an asset to the State. His training would not allow him to do it, and furthermore the Forests Act prohibits any dishonest transaction in this regard. Whatever excision is made through this method, the conservator still holds control of the forest product on the land in question.

What I am concerned about at the moment, and I think the Government should realise it, is that instead of bringing down the partial revocation of small areas of State forests for one particular purpose or another, whether it be for the straightening of boundaries, or the exchanging of land on which there is no timber for areas where timber is being grown, it is far more necessary to bring to the House an annual report showing all the applications which have been made for various areas of land, not in the State forests or in the timber reserves, but in areas that are open for land settlement throughout the State.

Because of the peculiar set-up we have in this State, the Minister for Lands, through his under secretary, has to refer to the Conservator of Forests all these applications before land can be made available to the people who apply for it. It is not mandatory but it is one of those things that have gone on over the years and has become Government policy. We should have a report from the conservator showing what applications have been refused, and on what grounds they have been refused. What he is doing now, and what has been done over the last 20 years, to my knowledge, is to turn down applications on the ground that "there is marketable timber on the area." Yet no true inspection is made of the land in question. I say that unreservedly.

What does the conservator mean when he says that "there is marketable timber on the area"? I have heard the present and past conservators speak on this question, and various explanations have

been given, such as the need for firewood in certain areas, certain timber is required for pulping, and other areas are suitable for the growing of pine. But in none of those cases could the land be said to have marketable timber on it, and the conservator has no right to turn down the applications on that basis. I think we are entitled to know what the conservator is doing in this regard when these stupid references are submitted to him by the Lands Department.

I know that in another place arguments have waxed fierce on this matter of taking away portions of the Queen's estate. The State forests may be part of the Queen's estate, but surely agricultural land in Western Australia should not be included in that category simply because at some time it may grow one jarrah tree per acre! Western Australia is facing, and will continue to face for some time to come insurmountable difficulties in becoming a secondary industry State. Our basic economy is built on primary production and the wealth of the land. If trade missions and the like encourage secondary industries to Western Australia they will be situated in the metropolitan area, despite all the moves that may be made for decentralisation.

Towns such as Manjimup and Bunbury, which have been built on the proceeds of primary production and the sawmilling industry, working hand in hand, will have to continue to rely on production from those sources. At present what is happening in the sawmilling industry is much the same as is happening in Collie. The majority of the employees are being subsidised from the public purse; it is better to do that than to close down certain activities.

As has been said time and time again, no hon. member on this side, or of the party to which I belonged when I was a member in another place, has ever wanted to attack the Queen's estate so far as State forests are concerned, but those large areas of country are suitable only for agricultural development or for supplying firewood for industries that do not exist in those particular parts. Of course, some of those areas that have been referred to may supply the raw material for charcoal production if charcoal iron ever becomes an established fact in the south-western portion of the State.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: It would be a pretty long haul.

The Hon. J: MURRAY: Even then, the haulage of such timber, because it could not be burnt on the site, would have to be over a very long distance so that it may be burnt on the job. So, as an economic proposition, it is bad.

What concerns me is this blanket cover to which I drew attention by way of questions only recently in this House. The Minister's reply to me was that the conservator had no such statutory power over these matters, but I knew that before he gave the answer to my question. Nevertheless, there is provision for these matters to be referred to him. But just as the Lands Department considers it is essential to refer those matters to the conservator, it is mandatory upon him to make an inspection forthwith to give us some idea of the timber potential on the land, but that is not done.

Only in a recent speech, I said that in the areas where I have been throughout the South-West there are large tracts of land which have been applied for, but the applications have been turned down by the conservator when they have been referred to him. He has said, "I will not recommend them as these areas have marketable timber on them." In one particular instance, so as to pinpoint the position, I drew attention to questions which were asked in regard to this particular land. These questions were asked in another place and they are framed in the following manner:—

> Referring to the blocks of land recently made available for selection at Tone River, can the Minister say how many applications have been received from—
>
> (a) local residents;
>
> (b) applicants other than local residents living in Western Australia;
>
> (c) Eastern States applicants?
>
> How much more land at Tone River is likely to become available in the near future?

The answers were—

(a) 24.

That is, 24 local residents.

(b) 3.

That is, three local residents other than those living in Western Australia.

(c) 72.

That is, 72 applicants from the Eastern States. However, only a few blocks of land have been thrown open after considerable pressure was brought to bear by the hon. member for Blackwood, to which I will refer in a minute. The second portion of the question was replied to as follows:—

> An area of 20,500 acres still remains unalienated in the Tone River subdivision.

That area is not a State forest, and it is not a forest reserve, but it is land which has been thrown open for selection after the Land Utilisation Committee has granted permission. The Forests Department has allowed four sawmills to operate in this area and it is anticipated that the cutting will proceed on two blocks at a rate of approximately 1,600 acres per annum each to be released subject to cutting and hauling conditions being satisfactory.

The estimate of the Conservator of Forests, when he talks about sawmills in the area, is only going to give two blocks at a cutting rate of 1,600 acres per year, making a total of 3,200 acres per year. These figures bring to my mind the picture of a very good stand of timber on those blocks which, of course, is entirely false. In the main, the standard of timber on those blocks does not represent an attractive proposition for any sawmiller today unless he is hard-pushed, and that means unless the conservator says he will make no other stand available until this particular land is cut out.

If one has to cut marketable timber on those blocks—20,000 acres on those terms—it is not a case of sawmilling in perpetuity, but it is a case of farmers waiting in perpetuity for a property to farm. In regard to the Tone River area this represents one of the aggravating situations in regard to these particular questions, because it is a tract of land which has been approved for use for certain purposes and denied to the people by this blanket refusal.

Let us have a look at the position in regard to the blocks that were thrown open for selection and were referred to in that question I have quoted. In 1950, the land was held for a possible project area under the war service land settlement scheme. In 1953, the land was to be made available for selection and surveys were put in hand. In September, 1954, the Conservator of Forests agreed to the immediate release of three blocks, the remainder to be free of timber in from 1½ to two years. In 1955, 1956, and 1957, constant representations for releases were made, but this timber was still not removed. An officer of the Forests Department was to inspect the stand of timber and report in 1957.

In 1958, the matter was discussed in April, with the Under Secretary for Lands, who suggested an interview with the Conservator of Forests. Letter after letter has piled up on the file which shows that this land has been applied for and requests have been made for its release. So, after that suggestion, the conservator was interviewed.

What did he say? He said. "If somebody will tell me what the block numbers were that had to be cleared, I might be able to do something about it." Strange but true! And that after eight years of correspondence over those blocks. The conservator's own letter reference was given to him and then, after referring to his own letter of September, 1954. he agreed it was a bad business. I also agreed it was a bad business; indeed I would say that was a shocking understatement of the true position.

My own experience with regard to this land, and other areas in the same portion of the State, is that the land does not belong to the State forest; it has nothing to do with the timber reserves of the State at all, but they are closely adjacent to it and in a good rainfall area. The blocks are continually denied to the people, because the conservator and his department are too disinterested to examine the position thoroughly, and release the land to the public generally.

I am not so concerned with the public generally as I am with the people in those areas who have been crying out for land for their sons and other relatives in order that they might establish them in those parts. Despite what I say about the Conservator of Forests being so disinterested, he is not so disinterested in a broad way, because he shows his interest by still wanting to hang on to all this land, whether it be in the State forest or not. I will illustrate that point very shortly. But even though the Conservator of Forests and the Under Secretary for Lands show a complete disinterest in this question, it is one of the most controversial in Western Australia today. It is the case of agricultural development versus a complete blanket shut out by the Conservator of Forests. This is not happening in State forests, or in timber reserves, but in the adjacent areas of land. Land which is only good for agricultural development and not for timber production.

The Under Secretary for Lands is not interested, and the Conservator of Forests is not interested, but "The Country Man" is very interested. Incidentally I had to buy my own copy of "The Country Man" because there was not one in the library. It is an extremely good publication, and I would recommend it to members with reference to this article. This paper sent one of its reporters, plus a photographer, to see some of the land that was spoken of. I recommend this article because it is worth reading. To have it on permanent record, however, I will quote portion of it. The Conservator of Forests has said the same thing time and time again; so much so that it has become worn out by repetition. The article reads as follows:—

> A Forests Department spokesman said this week that the land in question would eventually be released for selection—

That is if we live long enough. The article continues—

> —but only after millable timber has been removed from it.

The millable timber on the bulk of this country, which I inspected myself, is very small indeed. If the land is released for purposes of agricultural development, the Forests Department would still hold a controlling interest over the forest product in that area.

But the land is so far away from existing mills, and the timber is so poor in quality—some of it is not much better than the timber in King's Park; in fact I doubt whether it is better—

The Hon. H. C. Strickland: Is it poorer than the timber in King's Park?

The Hon. J. MURRAY: Some is; many thousands of acres of it are poorer than that. I venture to suggest with regard to this timber, which I say is of very poor quality, and which is very sparse in growth, that to get a haulier to haul it by motor truck to an existing mill the price would be at least £2 a load in the round, which means, of course, an average cost at the mill of £6 in the square. We would not be able to get a faller to fall that timber under an additional £1 a load. Let us take half that amount and say it would be 10s. That would make it £7 10s. hauling and falling; and, together with an additional 30s. royalty in the square for the timber, the price would be £9 before the timber was milled at all. Can anyone see mills operating on that class of timber without pricing themselves out of existence? I would say it is not millable timber. In one particular case that is quoted, 10,000 acres have been taken up, and the only thing that can probably be charged against that particular farmer is that he possibly took too much timber off his land; in other words he did not know sufficient about local conditions, or he did not ask about them. He may also be up for soil erosion and the like.

He also probably overstocked his 10,000 acres. But he has gone into it with a full heart, and has spent thousands of pounds in the property. Alongside him there is a man who took up a 1,000-acre property and he has been building that up for fat lambs. All the people down there are of the same type; they are confident not only that the land will produce, but that it will produce to the betterment of the State. They are proving to be good citizens of the country, and they are doing something towards helping the economic progress of the State.

Those are the people referred to in the reply to the question. Not only the 24 local residents but a further 72 from the Eastern States are waiting to take up this land. They have their own financial resources and will not depend on the Rural and Industries Bank for loans. They will contribute to the wealth of the State.

Although I have very little to do with primary production, and my chief interest is in the timber output of the State, I say that the basic wealth of this State is still its primary production. I commend the hon. member for Blackwood for his tenacity in endeavouring to have these blocks released. The copies of the conservator's letters show that he did not even know where these blocks were. The information contained in the motion for the partial revocation of areas of State forest shows what I have said is perfectly true. Once he is able to obtain any small portion of land he hangs on to it. He will declare: "Hands off until I am firmly convinced it is not worth anything, even to the farmers."

Area No. 11 is about one mile north of Karridale siding. It consists of approximately 460 acres of non-timbered land within the area known as the Boranup Sand Patch. It is to be excised from the State Forest and declared a reserve for minerals. The map before me shows the Boranup Sand Patch. The rest of the land is not worth anything as regards timber. Yet the conservator will not release the whole lot. He seems to have a futile mentality. Instead of releasing the area he is waiting for someone to apply for another excision.

On going through the list it will be noticed that there are very few applicants—11 in all—who are interested in obtaining land to increase their present holdings. What this House should be interested in are the large areas of land tied up for all time by the Lands Department and the Forests Department. I support the motion.

THE HON. G. C. MacKINNON (South-West) [1.15 a.m.]: I support the remarks made by the hon. Mr. Murray. I have been on two trips with him down the South-West and I know the care with which he has examined the timber position. The very real problem in the small isolated centres is for these people to become settled in some of the areas to which he made reference. Surely sympathetic consideration should be given in order that they may in time link up with the properties of their neighbours.

A great deal of public apathy on this matter is brought about by complete misunderstanding of what constitutes a tree of economic value. People travelling east and south of Boyup Brook see beautiful trees along the road and what they believe to be stretches of valuable forest land. If one were to examine the trees closely one would find that many of them branched into two at a height of 20 feet from the ground. They certainly continue to grow to a considerable height, and they resemble fine timber, about 18 to 20 inches through.

When a tree branches off at a height of 20 feet it is probably "pipey" and of no economic value. Furthermore, the short length of trunk limits the use to which the timber can be put. On closer examination the bark, instead of running true and straight for the length of the tree, is twisted. When the timber is sawn it shows up as short-grained in the pieces cut. Because of its short length, its "pipey" nature and its prevalence to twist, the

only thing for which it is useful is in the making of sleepers, although only a small number of first class sleepers can be obtained from each tree.

Yet to the ordinary traveller it appears to be fine timber. In other areas, patches of red gum and wandoo are found. Wandoo is probably one of the trickiest trees to pick out. One in 20 of these trees may be useful. So many people seem to be misled about our forests, and public opinion is to some extent guided by the views of these people.

I would suggest to hon. members when they travel along the roads in the South-West that they check the jarrah trees for size, as to how they branch and the nature of the bark. How different are they from the jarrah trees found in the belt around Dwellingup and Mornington. I support the motion.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North—in reply) [1.19 a.m.]: I have very little to say in reply. One can understand the hon. Mr. Murray and the hon. Mr. Willmott being concerned about the future of agricultural settlement. The fact that the Conservator of Forests is very jealous of the areas and does protect them, and is very keen to preserve the acreage which is dedicated to forests can be readily understood when one remembers the fact that Australia imports an enormous amount of timber from overseas. If one looks at the position in New Zealand today the famous kauri is cut out, except in one Maori forest; and that forest stretches from Rotorua to Te Whare. Mr. President, you would know that place on the coast near Napier. It is the only native forest left in either island of New Zealand. Because it is "Maori land" it is untouchable so to speak; and will always be preserved.

New Zealand is importing timber, and has been doing so for many years. One can drive on good roads for about 20 or 30-mile stretches and see forests of pine and Australian gums. This is as a result of reforestation. That is why some of the country about which the hon. Mr. Murray talks does not carry as much timber as King's Park; but it will be used for reforestation.

As I explained during the Address-in-reply, the Forests Department is buying back farms from farmers—old settlers.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: In areas suitable for pine plantation.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: I remember describing the areas during the Address-in-reply. I said that the Forests Department was paying £500, £600 or £700 for areas from which it was cutting £2,000 or £3,000 worth of timber.

There is another fact which cannot be overlooked. If this country were released for agricultural purposes, the person taking it over would need to have very substantial resources, because it is extremely costly to bring that type of land into production. This should not be necessary when we have so many thousands of acres of light land and plain country available.

The Hon. G. Bennetts: Especially in Esperance.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It is far better to encourage the agricultural development of that type of country and preserve the forest land, otherwise Western Australia will be in the same position as the other States of Australia, New Zealand and most of the other countries in the world; we will be very short of timber, and will have to rely on imports.

The Hon. G. C. MacKinnon: I think we will take you down and let you look at some of it.

The Hon. H. C. STRICKLAND: It has happened elsewhere and could happen here. I feel that although there may be some areas which could be released, there is a good case for the preservation of the timber resources of this State. Timber is a big and valuable industry.

It is interesting to note that 22½ per cent. of the commercial timber produced in Western Australia last year came from alienated land. Therefore, I would say that these farmers are really foresters.

The Hon. J. Murray: The royalty goes to the Conservator of Forests.

Question put and passed and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

First Reading.

Received from the Assembly and, on motion by the Hon. F. J. S. Wise (Minister for Town Planning) read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE HON. F. J. S. WISE (Minister for Town Planning—North) [1.25 a.m.] in moving the second reading said: As we all have a clear understanding of the contents of this Bill, I move—

> That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE HON. H. C. STRICKLAND (Minister for Railways—North): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.30 p.m. today.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 1.28 a.m. (Friday).

Legislative Assembly

Thursday, the 4th December, 1958.

CONTENTS

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.